caut BULLETIN acpu

OCTOBER 1972 OCTOBRE
21-1

executive 1972-1973

bureau de direction 1972-1973

president	Charles C. Bigelow (Western Ontario)	*président*
past-president	Robert Bertrand (Montréal)	*président sortant*
vice-president	Evelyn Moore (Calgary)	*vice-président*
treasurer	Christopher K. Knapper (Regina)	*trésorier*
members	Marie-Andrée Bertrand (Montréal) S. Finn Gallagher (Trent) Richard Spencer (U.B.C.)	*membres*

central office

secrétariat

66 Lisgar, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C1
(613) 237-6885

executive secretary	Alwyn Berland	*secrétaire général*
associate executive secretary	Donald C. Savage	*secrétaire générale adjoint*
assistant executive secretary	Pierre Leahey	*secrétaire générale assistant*
executive assistants	Marie-Claire Pommez William Goede	*assistants exécutifs*

editor	Israel Cinman	*rédacteur*
advertising office	66 Lisgar, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C1 (613) 237-6885	*Publicité*

Published six times a year.
Subscription rates : $12.00 per year.
Postage paid in cash at third and fourth class rates.
On permit number 3064.

Six livraisons par année.
L'abonnement est de $12.00 par année.
L'affranchissement en numéraire comme objet de troisième ou quatrième classe.
Permis numéro 3064.

C.A.U.T. BULLETIN

A.C.P.U.

a publication of the canadian association of university teachers/publié par l'association canadienne des professeurs d'université

volume 21 tome — october 1972 octobre — number 1 numéro

table of contents — table des matières

Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi ... 3
A. E. Malloch

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure ... 6
A. E. Malloch

Improving Teaching Effectiveness ... 9
Chris Knapper

Rapport du Secrétaire Général ... 12

Report of the Executive Secretary ... 17

Book Reviews/Comptes Rendus

Financing Post Secondary Education in Canada: A Report Commissioned by the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada. By Stephen G. Peitchinis. Calgary, 1971.
Reviewed by C. B. Macpherson and J. Percy Smith ... 22

Academic Freedom and the Law. Report of the Commission appointed by the National Union of Students and by the National Council for Civil Liberties. London, 1970.
Reviewed by Donald C. Savage ... 27

Letters to the Editor / Lettres au Rédacteur.
Donald C. Savage, E. M. Oppenheimer, Alec Sehon ... 29

Documents

C.A.U.T. Opting Out Survey ... 30

Written Reasons and the Risk of Libel Actions ... 31

Le professeur Donald C. Savage a été désigné par le bureau de direction de l'A.C.P.U. pour remplir les fonctions de Secrétaire général à partir de janvier 1973. Le professeur Savage a fait ses études d'abord à Montréal où il a reçu son titre de bachelier ès arts (B.A.) de l'Université McGill. Il est docteur en Histoire (Ph.D.) de l'Université de Londres (G.-B.). de 1958 à 1960, il a été chargé de cours au collège de Waterloo (l'actuelle Waterloo Lutheran University). De 1960 à 1961, chargé spécial d'enseignement à l'Université de Londres, adjoint puis professeur agrégé au Collège Loyola à Montréal, en tre 1961 et 1970, où il occupait également le poste de directeur du Centre des Études africaines et président de l'association des professeurs. Durant trois ans, il a été l'éditeur de la *Revue canadienne des Études africaines,* secrétaire-trésorier du Comité sur les Études africaines au Canada (maintenant l'Association canadienne des Études africaines), président de l'Association d'Histoire de Montréal, et directeur de l'orientation pour les programmes d'Est et de Centre Afrique de S.U.C.O., entre 1966 et 1970. Il s'est joint au personnel de l'A.C.P.U. en 1970 comme Secrétaire général adjoint.

Professor Donald C. Savage has been appointed by the Board of the C.A.U.T. to be Executive Secretary commencing on 1 January 1973. Professor Savage was educated in Montreal and received his B.A. from McGill University and his Ph.D. from the University of London. He was a lecturer at Waterloo College (now Waterloo Lutheran University) in 1958-60, special lecturer at the University of London in 1960-61, assistant and then associate professor at Loyola College, Montreal between 1961 and 1970 where he was also Director of the Centre for African Studies and President of the Faculty Association in 1969. He was editor for three years of the *Canadian Journal of African Studies,* secretary-treasurer of the Committee on African Studies in Canada (now the Canadian Association of African Studies), president of the History Association of Montreal, and director of orientation for the East and Central Africa Programme of C.U.S.O. between 1966 and 1970. He joined the staff of C.A.U.T. in 1970 as Associate Executive Secretary.

Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi

par A. E. MALLOCH

Monsieur le président, le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi s'est réuni cinq fois au cours de l'année universitaire 1971-1972. Il s'est occupé de 103 appels, dont certains remontaient à l'année précédente. Comme par les années passées, il s'agissait d'appels très variés, comme par exemple de simples appels téléphoniques sans lendemains. D'autres cas ont nécessité une longue correspondance et des discussions lors de nos réunions, et d'autres encore ont exigé une enquête sur place de la part des membres du secrétariat ou de petits comités.

La plupart des appels avaient trait au non-renouvellement des nominations ou au refus de la permanence. Certains étaient provoqués par un refus d'avancement. La question des réductions d'effectif est souvent revenue, soit comme raison de non-renouvellement, soit comme circonstance aggravante. Dans un cas, il s'agissait d'un problème d'immigration et de déportation. Un autre appel nous a laissé croire pendant un certain temps que nous aurions notre premier grief de discrimination contre une femme professeur, mais l'appelante a décidé de chercher à obtenir réparation en ayant recours à la publicité plutôt qu'aux procédures d'appel universitaires, si bien que nous avons perdu notre occasion de prouver que nous étions prêts — et nous le sommes toujours — à donner suite à de tels appels.

Cette année, le Comité a délibérément essayé d'agir sans tarder dans des cas qui menaçaient de provoquer de graves difficultés. Alwyn Berland et Donald Savage on fait plusieurs visites sur les lieux et, dans d'autres cas, nous avons envoyé, ou autorisé, des équipes d'enquête. Cette politique délibérée, de concert avec la diffusion des directives sur les procédures de grief, peut expliquer le fait que nous n'avons pas fait de recommandations pratiques au Comité exécutif ou au Conseil au sujet des appels interjetés cette année. Vous avez pu voir dans le rapport du Trésorier que le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi n'a pas dépensé tous les fonds que le budget de 1971-1972 lui avait affectés. J'espère que vous ne tirerez pas de conclusions trop hâtives, c'est tout simplement que l'Association a accompli davantage cette année, tout en dépensant moins.

En plus d'étudier les cas, nous avons préparé ou fait préparer des documents qui, selon nous, aideraient à régler ou à prévenir des cas mettant en cause la liberté universitaire et la permanence de l'emploi. Certains ont été publiés, d'autres sont encore en gestation. Le petit manuel sur la permanence a d'abord été publié dans le *Communiqué* et il vient d'être publié dans le *Bulletin* dans sa version définitive et dans les deux langues. Un document sur le recours aux ombudsmans a été publié dans le *Bulletin*. Un contrat type pour les professeurs et un document sur ce qui constitue légalement un « avis » sont tous deux en préparation. Un document sur les griefs mettant en cause des administrateurs d'université tels que les directeurs de département et les doyens de faculté a été publié dans le *Bulletin*, et soumis à l'étude des associations locales, et le Comité en a déduit — avec l'approbation du Comité exécutif — qu'il devait interpréter son mandat de façon à recevoir les griefs de ces personnes lorsque l'appel a nettement trait à la liberté universitaire. Le professeur Bruce Dunlop, un ancien président du Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi, a satisfait à une demande de longue date des associations locales et des administrateurs d'université concernant la préparation d'un document sur la diffamation et son rapport avec l'exposé des raisons du non-renouvellement ou du refus de la permanence. Ce document a été récemment communiqué aux associations locales et il sera publié sous peu. Nous essayons de préparer des directives sur le règlement des cas d'aliénation mentale, mais il est presque aussi difficile de préparer de telles directives que de traiter les cas d'aliénation mentale — ce qui ne nous empêche pas de persévérer.

Même si nous n'avons pas relevé de cas particulièrement litigieux parmi les appels cette année, on retrouve dans certains appels un problème qui nous cause de graves préoccupations et sur lequel je voudrais attirer l'attention du Conseil et de tous les membres de

l'Association. Souvent, il y a trois ou quatre ans, on pouvait dire des appels interjetés auprès de nous que même si aucune solution raisonnable ne semblait s'offrir à l'université en eause, le cas serait quand même réglé de façon satisfaisante ear il se trouverait quelque autre université canadienne qui serait à la recherche d'un homme possédant précisément les qualités à l'origine du litige à la première université. Notre appelant se voyait offrir eette nomination, l'acceptait, quittait la première université d'un air méprisant et nous écrivait pour nous demander de ne pas donner suite à son appel. Les administrateurs et les professeurs de la première université poussaient alors un soupir de soulagement et se mettaient en quête du genre de professeur qu'*ils* désiraient. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire qu'une telle solution s'offre rarement aujourd'hui, et que si un professeur n'est pas renommé ou qu'on lui refuse la permanenee, ses ehances d'enseigner dans quelque université que ce soit sont très minces. De fait, ses chanees de travailler tout simplement peuvent parfois être médiocres.

Mais le problème qui me préoecupe ne déeoule pas simplement de la pénurie de postes professoraux. Il a également trait à la disponibilité d'un si grand nombre de personnes compétentes et qui sont sans travail. La disponibilité de ces gens semble encourager les comités ehargés de statuer sur l'avancement et la permanence d'emploi dans un département et les direeteurs de département à être de plus en plus exigeants pour ee qui est des renominations et de la permanence d'emploi. S'ils étaient exigeants simplement du point de vue de la compétence universitaire, le Comité n'aurait pas forcément de raisons de s'inquiéter, malgré les tribulations que cela peut représenter pour les intéressés. Mais nous avons constaté dans un eertain nombre de cas dont nous avons été saisis cette année que d'autres critères entrent en ligne de compte. Il semble que nous en sommes arrivés au point où les départements, grâce à un savant mélange de non-rcnouvellements et de nouvelles nominations, peuvent faire en sorte que personne n'enseigne chez eux s'il refuse de suivre une eertaine orientation dans une discipline, orientation imprimée par la majorité des votes au département. Dans les seienees sociales en particulier, nous voyons qu'un département radieal peut se défaire de ses dissidents de droite ou qu'un département traditionaliste peut se débarrasser de ses radicaux et, ee qui plus est, tout en respeetant les procédures recommandées par l'A.C.P.U. Il est extrêmement difficile de traiter de tels eas, non seulement paree qu'il est parfois impossible d'alléguer que les procédures n'ont pas été suivies, mais aussi parce que la déeision a pu être prise pour la raison la plus noble — une profonde eonseienee de sa propre orthodoxie. Toutefois, nous devons faire valoir l'argument que si la liberté universitaire a le sens que nous lui aeeordons dans notre énoneé de prineipes — le droit d'enseigner, de faire des reeherches et d'élaborer des théories indépendamment de toute doctrine établie —, nous ne pouvons tolérer que la doctrine établie deviene le prineipal eritère pour déterminer le droit d'un individu à une ehaire. Au eours de l'histoire, l'expression « doetrine établie » a désigné principalement l'orthodoxie ecclésiastique ou politique, or nous nous sommes toujours opposés à l'imposition d'une doctrine, non seulement paree qu'elle constitue une atteinte à la liberté du professeur, mais parce que par le fait même, elle appauvrit la vie intelleetuelle de l'université et limite les oecasions que les étudiants ont de s'instruire. Nous aurions sans doute les mêmes objections à l'établissement d'une doetrine par les professeurs dans une diseipline — même s'ils sont aussi intimement convaineus que les gouverneurs de naguère qu'ils le font pour le bien des étudiants qui, affirme-t-on, ne sont pas venus à l'université pour se faire induire en erreur sur la nature des scienees politiques, ou se faire ineulquer des principes éeonomiques erronés.

Il me semble que si l'on prône sérieusement la liberté universitaire, il faut néeessairement prôner sérieusement le pluralisme, y eompris le pluralisme dans les diseiplines universitaires. Bien entendu, ehaque professeur a la responsabilité d'aider à préserver les normes d'enseignement dans son département, mais quand un eertain nombre de professeurs qui ont une eoneeption commune de leur diseipline commencent à utiliser cette eoneeption eomme pierre de touehe d'un enseignement valable, nous entrons alors dans une nouvelle ère d'orthodoxie, et pour les gens orthodoxes, il est notoire que l'erreur n'a pas les même droits que la vérité. Il s'ensuit que eeux qui propagent l'erreur n'ont pas les même droits de postuler une chaire que ceux qui propagent la vérité.

Je ne sous-estime pas la difficulté de conserver un équilibre entre la responsabilité envers les normes de la diseipline, d'une part, et un sain pluralisme, d'autre part. Je sais aussi que les universités peuvent parfois arrêter des politiques délibérées et justifiables dans le but de se eoneentrer sur un élément d'une discipline en exeluant virtuellement les autres. Mais dans les départements qui offrent un vaste programme d'études du premier grade, il me semble qu'il est injustifiable que la majorité des professeurs eherehent à exclure toutes les façons d'envisager la diseipline en eause, sauf la leur. Je me rends compte que l'aeeeptation du pluralisme peut demander énormément de patienee ou d'abnégation de la part de la majorité du département lorsqu'il est question de renouvellement, d'avancement ou de permanence. Comment un groupe de professeurs peut-il juger de la valeur relative d'un de leurs collègues dont toute la conception de la diseipline semble être caraetérisée par l'obstination (même si la diseipline a la réputation d'être le refuge d'une foule de mauvaises têtes du genre dans toutes les universités du pays) ? Ou encore, pour reprendre la question que le direeteur d'un département m'a carrément posée l'automne dernier: « Oui, mais à quels signes reconnaît-on un bon sociologue radical ? »

Pourtant, malgré les difficultés inhérentes et la nécessité de faire contrepoids, le pluralisme dans une discipline est un objectif réalisable, si nous consentons à le considérer comme un objectif et à résister à la tentation que nous éprouvons tous parfois de ne frayer dans nos départements qu'avec les collègues qui partagent nos convictions.

Au Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi, nous avons vu que ce problème était assez manifeste dans les cas où l'on invoque la conception d'une discipline comme raison pour ne pas renouveler le contrat ou refuser la permanence. Mais le plus souvent, il s'est présenté sous le couvert de l'« incompatibilité ». Il nous a paru évident dans plusieurs cas qu'un homme était jugé incompatible par la majorité de ses collègues parce que sa conception de la discipline différait nettement de la leur et qu'ils ne tenaient pas à être en contact régulier avec le tenant de telles idées. De toute évidence, il s'ensuivait qu'un individu avec lequel ils ne voulaient pas avoir de contacts réguliers devait être incompatible.

Dans d'autres cas encore où l'on a invoqué l'« incompatibilité » comme raison pour ne pas renouveler le contrat ou refuser la permanence, nous n'avons constaté aucune divergence d'opinions sur le plan purement universitaire. Il s'agissait simplement de différences dans les habitudes, les manières, la coiffure, l'habillement, le ton et l'ampleur de la voix — bref, ce qu'on appelle généralement la « manière de vivre ». S'il est décourageant d'avoir à signaler que dans certains départements de nos universités les divergences d'opinions professionnelles sont parfois interprétées comme étant de l'« incompatibilité », il est tout simplement pitoyable d'avoir à signaler que dans d'autres départements, souvent de petits départements, les professeurs semblent incapables de passer sur les simples fantaisies de leurs collègues.

Dans son Énoncé de principes, l'A.C.P.U. a adopté un processus qui accorde aux professeurs un rôle prépondérant dans les décisions relatives aux nominations universitaires. Toutefois, même si toutes les directives sont suivies, les décisions vaudront en proportion du bien-fondé ou de la justice des jugements humains dont elles découlent. Nos directives permettent de prendre des décisions justes et sages, mais elles ne peuvent les garantir. Elles nous fournissent l'occasion de faire preuve de bon sens, mais sans garantie de réussite. Si les procédures prévues dans l'Énoncé de principes finissent par servir à orchestrer notre intolérance et nos préjugés instinctifs, ils deviendront infiniment plus nuisibles que le froid autoritarisme de vilains doyens et directeurs de département. Le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi a constaté avec inquiétude que parfois on fait un emploi abusif des procédures, comme je l'ai expliqué plus haut, et cette question me paraît assez sérieuse pour que je la porte à l'attention de tous les membres de l'Association. Le Comité permanent de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi a été chargé de faire respecter certaines normes de liberté universitaire envers et contre tous. Il est plus facile et plus amusant de se battre contre l'« administration », mais de toute évidence, il est parfois nécessaire de nous battre contre nous-mêmes pour veiller à ce que les professeurs, en exerçant un contrôle de plus en plus grand sur les nominations universitaires, ne deviennent pas à leur tour ennemis de la liberté universitaire.

Comme d'habitude, ce sont les membres du secrétariat qui ont fait le gros du travail du Comité. Le secrétaire du Comité, Don Savage, et l'autre membre du secrétariat, Al Berland, ont reçu la plupart des appels téléphoniques, se sont occupés du plus gros de la correspondance et ont fait pratiquement toutes les visites de conciliation. Je suis sûr que les membres du Conseil voudront se joindre à moi pour les remercier de toute la besogne qu'ils ont abattue. Enfin, je voudrais remercier deux membres du Comité dont le mandat de trois ans vient d'expirer, le professeur Din Pal de l'Université de Victoria, et le professeur Jenny Ashworth de l'Université de Waterloo.

vacancy

C. A. U. T.
Associate Executive Secretary

— to undertake association work, particularly in the area of academic freedom and tenure.

— experience with C.A.U.T. or local or provincial associations essential.

— bilingualism preferred.

— associate professor rank.

Applications with the names of three referees to: Chairman, Search Committee, C.A.U.T., 66 Lisgar, Ottawa K2P 0C1.

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure

By A. E. MALLOCH

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure met five times during the academic session of 1971-1972. We handled 103 appeals, a number of which were carried over from the previous year. As in years past, the appeals made very uneven demands on us: some were single phone calls without follow-up; others required lengthy correspondence and consideration at our meetings; and still others were carried to the stage of on-the-spot investigation by members of the central office staff, or by small committees.

Most of the appeals had to do with the non-renewal of appointment or denial of tenure. Some dealt with denial of promotion. The issue of cutbacks appeared often either as the grounds for non-renewal, or as an aggravating element in the non-renewal. One case involved a problem of immigration and deportation. Another appeal promised for a time to be our first grievance on grounds of discrimination against a woman academic, but the appellant decided to seek redress through publicity rather than through academic appeal procedures, so we lost our opportunity to demonstrate our readiness — which remains — to act on such appeals.

We made a deliberate effort in the committee this year to take early initiatives in cases that showed potential for real trouble. Alwyn Berland and Donald Savage made a number of visits to trouble spots, and we sent (or authorized) investigating committees for others. This deliberate policy, together with the circulation of the guidelines on grievance procedures, may account for the fact that we have brought forward no recommendation for action out of cases appealed to us this year, either to the Executive Committee or to Council. You have seen in the Treasurer's report that A.F.&T. has not fully expended the funds provided for it in the 1971-72 budget. I ask you not to draw any hasty inferences. The fact is that the Association has simply been getting more work for less money this year.

In addition to our case work, we have prepared or commissioned papers that we thought would be useful in dealing with or preventing A.F.&T. cases. Some have been issued, others are still in the works. The Primer on Tenure was printed first in the *Newsletter* and now has been printed in a final version in both languages in the *Bulletin*. A paper on the use of ombudsmen has been published in the *Bulletin*. A model form for faculty contracts and a paper on what constitutes "notice" in law are both being prepared. A paper on grievances involving such academic administrators as departmental chairmen and deans of faculties was published in the *Bulletin*, circulated to local associations for comment, and has led the committee — with the approval of the Executive Committee — to interpret its mandate in such a way as to allow it to receive grievances from these persons where the context of the appeal is clearly one of academic freedom. Professor Bruce Dunlop, a former chairman of the A.F.&T. Committee, has met a long-standing demand from local associations and from academic administrators for a paper on defamation and its relation to the giving of reasons (for non-renewal or the denial of tenure); the paper has recently been circulated to local associations and will be published shortly. We are trying to prepare guidelines on the handling of cases involving mental illness, but it has proved almost as difficult to prepare such guidelines as it is to deal with cases of mental illness — but we are continuing the effort.

Though we are not bringing forward any major case from the appeals of this year, there is a problem appearing in a number of appeals that causes us a great deal of concern and which I would like to bring to the attention of Council and of all members of the Association. Three or four years ago it was often true of cases appealed to us that though there didn't appear to be a reasonable solution available on the campus in question, the matter would be concluded happily anyway because it turned out that another university elsewhere

in the country was looking for a man with just those qualities which had served to produce the case on the first campus. Our appellant would be offered this appointment, would accept it, would make a scornful exit form the first campus, and would write to us asking that we take no further action on his appeal. The administrative officers and faculty members on the first campus would then heave a sigh of relief and begin to search for the sort of man *they* wanted. I need hardly tell you that this sort of resolution seldom offers itself now, and that if a faculty member is not reappointed or is not granted tenure, his chances of teaching anywhere at a university are very poor. Indeed his chances of working at all may sometimes be poor.

But the problem I am concerned with does not flow simply from the shortage of teaching positions; it relates also to the availability of so many qualified persons without positions. The availability of these persons represents an inducement, apparently, to departmental promotion and tenure committees, and to departmental chairmen, to be increasingly tough in matters of reappointment and the granting of tenure. If they were tough merely in terms of scholarly and teaching ability, then the A.F.&T. Committee wouldn't necessarily have reason to be concerned, though the human hardship would remain. But in a number of the cases appealed to us this year we have seen other criteria at work. The time has come it seems when departments, by a delicate mixture of non-renewals and new appointments, can insure that no one teaches in the department unless he shares a particular orientation toward the discipline — that orientation defined by the voting majority of the department. In the social sciences particularly that historical moment presents itself when the radical department can rid itself of its dissidents on the right, or when the traditionalist department can unload its radicals. And do it, moreover, according to the best C.A.U.T. procedures. This sort of case is extremely difficult to deal with, not only because there may be no procedural violation alleged, but because the exercise may have been undertaken with that most elevated of motives — a strong sense of one's own orthodoxy. Nevertheless, the point must be made that if academic freedom means what we say it means in our policy statement — "the right to teach, investigate, and speculate without reference to prescribed doctrine" — we cannot tolerate situations in which prescribed doctrine becomes the principle criterion for determining a man's claim to hold a teaching appointment at all. Historically, the phrase "prescribed doctrine" has been understood chiefly in terms of ecclesiastical or political orthodoxy. And we have always objected to the prescribing of doctrine, not merely because it invades the freedom of the individual faculty member, but because in so doing, it impoverishes the intellectual life of the university and restricts the learning opportunities of its students. We are bound to lodge the same objections against the prescribing of doctrine by professors within a discipline — even though they may feel as strongly as did the governors of yesteryear that they are doing it for the good of the students, who did not — it is argued — come to the university to be misled as to the nature of political science, or to be taught unsound economics.

A serious commitment to academic freedom seems to me to involve necessarily a serious commitment to pluralism, including pluralism within academic disciplines. Of course, every faculty member has the responsibility to help safeguard the standards of learning and teaching within his department, but when a number of faculty members who share a common perception of their discipline begin to use that perception as the touch-stone for sound learning, then we have entered a new age of orthodoxy, and for the orthodox it is notorious that error does not have the same rights as truth. The corollary is that those who propagate error do not have the same claim to be considered for academic appointments as those who propagate truth.

I don't underestimate the difficulty of maintaining a balance between responsibility to the standards of the discipline on the one hand, and a healthy pluralism on the other. And I am aware that there can sometimes be deliberate and justifiable academic policy decisions to concentrate on one element in a discipline to the virtual exclusion of others. But in departments where there is a wide program of undergraduate teaching, it seems to me to be indefensible for the majority of faculty members to try to filter out all orientations toward the discipline except their own. I realize that the commitment to pluralism can make very heavy demands for forbearance or self-abnegation on the voting majority in the department when questions of renewal, promotion and tenure come up. How does a group of faculty members judge the relative quality of one of their colleagues whose whole approach to the discipline seems to them wrongheaded (even though the discipline is known to harbour many such wrongheaded persons in universities across the country)? Or, to repeat the blunt question put to me last autumn by a departmental chairman, "Yes, but how do I recognize a good radical sociologist when I see one?"

Nevertheless, in spite of the difficulties involved and the need to balance the various demands, pluralism within a discipline is a feasible goal, if we are willing to accept it as a goal, and to resist the tendency we all feel from time to time to huddle together in our departments with colleagues of the same disciplinary persuasion.

In the A.F.&T. Committee we have met this problem in a fairly visible form, in cases where orientation to the discipline is given as a reason for non-renewal, or denial of tenure. But more commonly we meet it in the guise of "incompatibility." It has seemed clear to us in several cases that a man was judged incompatible by the majority of his colleagues because he differed significantly from them in his view of the discipline, and they were unwilling to be in regular

contact with someone who held such different views. It followed apparently, that someone they were unwilling to be in regular contact with must be incompatible.

In still other cases in which the reason for non-renewal or denial of tenure was "incompatibility," we could not discern any academic disagreements at all. The incompatibility seemed to consist only in differences of social habit, manner, coiffure, dress, tone and volume of voice — those things generally consolidated under the term "life style." If it is discouraging to have to point out that in some departments in our universities different orientations toward the discipline can be construed as "incompatibility," it is downright pathetic to have to report that in other (often small) departments faculty members seem unable to tolerate merely personal vagaries in one another.

C.A.U.T. has committed itself in the Policy Statement to a process that gives faculty members the major role in decisions on academic appointment. But even if all the procedural guidelines are followed, the decisions themselves will only be as wise or just as the human judgments that go into them. Our guidelines enable, but cannot ensure, the exercise of wisdom and justice. They can provide the time and opportunity for our better judgments to prevail, but they cannot guarantee the process. If the procedures of the Policy Statement come to be used as a kind of formal orchestration of our instinctive intolerance or prejudices, then they will appear infinitely more mischievous than the naked authoritarianism of bad old deans and department heads. The A.F.&T. Committee has been disturbed to find evidence that our procedures are sometimes abused in the ways I describe, and the matter seems serious enough to call to the attention of all members of the Association. The standing committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has been charged to safeguard certain standards of academic freedom against threat from whatever quarter. It is easier and more fun to do battle with "the administration"; but it is obviously sometimes necessary to do battle against ourselves, to insure that faculty members, as they assume more and more control over academic appointments, do not in turn become enemies of academic freedom.

The bulk of the committee's work, as always, has been done by members of the Central Office staff. Don Savage, the secretary of the Committee, and Al Berland, the other member from Central Office, have fielded most of the phone calls, dealt with most of the correspondence, and made virtually all the trouble-shooting visits. I am sure that members of Council will want to join me in thanking them for all the work they have done. Finally, I want to thank those two members of the committee who have finished their three-year term of duty on the committee, Professor Din Pal of the University of Victoria and Professor Jenny Ashworth of the University of Waterloo.

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

ANNOUNCES

THE J. H. STEWART REID MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP

FOR 1973-74

Value of Award : $2,500. *Where Tenable :* In the graduate program at any Canadian university. *Field of Study :* Unrestricted. *Duration :* The Award is for one year. A successful candidate may reapply in the competition in the following year. *Qualifications :* (a) Canadian citizenship or residence in Canada with landed immigrant status from 1 February 1972 or earlier; (b) Graduate student standing, or admission to a Canadian graduate program by time of award. *Closing Date for Applications :* 1 February 1973. For further information and application forms, write to : Awards Officer, Canadian Association of University Teachers, 66 Lisgar Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 0C1.

Improving Teaching Effectiveness

By Chris Knapper

Chris Knapper is Chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Saskatchewan (Regina), Treasurer of C.A.U.T. and Chairman of the C.A.U.T. Committee on Professional Orientation.

It is perhaps rather strange that the most neglected aspect of the university teacher's work is his teaching function. In spite of the name of the organization, the Canadian Association of University Teachers set up a committee * to study teaching effectiveness only as recently as 1970. However, the pressure is mounting; it comes from students, and from administrators responding to pressure from the general public; it sometimes even comes from faculty, especially in those institutions where students have produced anti-calendars or have begun to ask for a say in the evaluation of their teachers for the purposes of granting tenure, promotion, or merit increases. Not only C.A.U.T., but O.C.U.F.A. and A.U.C.C. have also set up committees on teaching effectiveness, and many individual universities have begun to take positive steps to encourage greater emphasis on the teaching role of faculty members.

To understand the reactions of Canadian academics to this new (or renewed) emphasis on teaching art, it is necessary to examine the traditional role of the university in Canada and see how it has developed over the last few years.

Canadian universities have grown up under the influence of two very strong traditions in higher education: the European tradition, and the United States "liberal arts" tradition. The former stresses the training of an intellectual elite as well as the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, whereas the latter places emphasis upon a general education for all. This model is of course grossly over-simplified and does not take into account the problems of professional training in universities — an area in which demands for effective teaching have perhaps been made most forcefully. It is also true that the distinction made above is gradually breaking down as the two models slowly converge. However, while higher education in Britain is moving more closely towards liberal arts goals (the University of Sussex and the Open University are good examples of this trend), in Canada much of the Oxbridge philoso-

* The Professional Orientation Committee.

phy of university education still remains to haunt as well as challenge us.

All this has important implications for the way the teaching function is perceived by Canadian academics. The Oxbridge view of teaching is well exemplified by the following statement by Mr. Wacek Koc, Lecturer in Higher Education at the University of Lancaster, England, who writes: [2]

> "It is . . . the usual experience of most people at universities who care to be objective, that academics do in fact like to teach and mostly are very good at it, especially in the circumstances where their unique knowledge can be appreciated and enjoyed. Such circumstances are far more frequently met at universities than at schools or technical colleges . . ."

The idea is that the teaching function is essentially a by-product of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake; its main ingredient is an enthusiasm for the subject matter at hand rather than any technical skills at communication. There is of course an implicit assumption underlying this view — that the student is motivated in a direction similar to the faculty member.

In the contemporary Canadian university there is a good chance that such an assumption may not be met : witness the ubiquitous appeal for "relevance" from students in all disciplines. The demand for relevance has been paralleled by an increasing anxiety on the part of faculty that perhaps something should be done to improve teaching standards in Canadian universities. A variety of suggestions has been discussed for rewarding effective university teaching. These range from giving a prize to the "teacher of the year" to officially recognizing the importance of teaching in yearly evaluations of faculty. All the solutions, however, beg an important question : for to reward outstanding teaching you must first be able to recognize it. Who is in a position to do this — university administrators ? faculty colleagues ? students ? or the teacher himself ?

The principle methods which have been adopted in Canadian universities to assess teaching are student evaluation and classroom visits. In a recent survey undertaken by C.A.U.T., [3] 28 out of 34 responding institutions said that some use was made of student course evaluations to judge teaching effectiveness. Such evaluations range from formal and standardized questionnaires, used across the entire university and organized by the university administration, through the student-organized anti-calendars, to informal questioning of selected students about the content of a particular class. In very few cases do the evaluation procedures have any established validity (although validated forms do exist); this is perhaps why student evaluations have provoked considerable faculty hostility in some institutions.

In the case of classroom visits, approximately 35% of responding universities said such visits took place : in many cases the information so obtained was used in connection with promotion and merit increases. On the other hand the belief that such visits in some way interfere with academic freedom is not at all uncommon.

Although some universities are busily evaluating teaching, there is no evidence that any universally accepted definition of good teaching is available — in fact there is evidence to the contrary. Professor Edward Sheffield of the University of Toronto has recently completed a study in which he identified successful teachers in the universities throughout Canada and found that their teaching styles, their teaching strengths and weaknesses, varied considerably, and that what was perceived as good teaching depended as much upon the expectations of student as it did upon the ability of the faculty member concerned.

Nonetheless nearly *all* the universities claimed that they reward good teaching in some way and thus tacitly assume that it can be identified. Eighty per cent of the institutions who responded to the C.A.U.T. survey replied "yes" to the question: "Is quality of teaching taken into account when considering a faculty member for promotion or merit increases ?" The key question though is "in what way ?" and responses here take us back into the area of student evaluation and classroom visits, which are frequently used to aid the work of the merit and promotions committee. Occasionally the criteria for judging successful teaching are alarmingly simple, as in the case of an Atlantic university which determines success in terms of "the number of passing grades obtained" !

In view of this confusing situation is there anything at all that can be done to help university teachers improve ? I believe that the key concepts are those of feedback, self-insight and exploration on the part of the individual faculty member. For this reason I am generally in favour of both classroom visits and student evaluations, providing that they are seen in a proper perspective and not regarded as the sole or a completely valid and objective way of assessing teaching performance. To obtain such a perspective it is important that the sort of evidence described above should be utilized within the wider context of a more general examination of the nature and function of teaching. Some universities are recognizing this by organizing seminars, courses and conferences for faculty to discuss the whole question of the teaching function. Such activity has been common in the United States for many years and the courses run by Pennsylvania State University have achieved world-wide fame. The idea seems to have crossed the Atlantic about five years ago, and training courses for university faculty are now run by a number of British universities, notably the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, the University of Lancaster, and the University of London.

[2] Personal communication, 1971.
[3] See next issue for the Report of the Professional Orientation Committee on Teaching Evaluation, presented to Council, May, 1972.

Typical content of these courses includes material on the psychology of the learning process, and sociology of small group processes, curriculum design, educational technology (including programmed learning and audio-visual techniques), creativity, staff/student relations, examinations, student counselling, as well as more mundane information on the organization of the university itself. Such courses, lasting anywhere from an afternoon to a week, are obvious aimed at new faculty, but courses for more senior faculty have also been organized successfully. In Britain the recently formed (and severely under-funded) Society for Research into Higher Education is trying to co-ordinate these efforts, as well as sponsor its own research in the area.

Canadian universities have been relatively slow to provide this sort of opportunity for faculty/student discussion on the teaching process, though most readers will be familiar with the excellent work done by the McGill Centre for Learning and Development. The C.A.U.T. survey revealed 13 institutions which offered some form of course or seminar for university teachers. Often these are organized by the Faculty of Education and just as often they are unsuccessful for this very reason !

In contrast, Australian universities invariably have some sort of service available for faculty to provide advice on teaching. A typical example is the Tertiary Education Research Centre of the University of New South Wales which employs no fewer than twenty full-time members directly or indirectly involved in research and development projects to improve the teaching/learning process. Monash University this year introduced a two year part-time Diploma in Education course specifically designed for people teaching in universities.

This introduces the interesting notion that potential faculty members should receive some form of teacher training as part of their graduate work — an idea presently being explored in a number of institutions in the United States. For example, as part of the new Doctor of Arts at Lehigh University, students are required to do a supervised internship in college teaching. In addition they must undertake a research project evolving from their classroom experience during the internship and which may deal with innovative approaches to curriculum preparation and presentation, such as course structure, curriculum materials, development of new educational technologies, novel means of communicating the discipline, etc. Still other universities are including courses in university government and professional ethics. All this is somewhat paradoxical in view of the fact that a doctoral degree is no longer the automatic passport to university teaching as it was once considered to be.

I believe that these are all developments which require our close attention; at the same time I have not forgotten my previous sentiments that the criteria of effective teaching are obscure. The best of these courses do not claim to present the faculty member with a foolproof technology of teaching; instead they aim to provide faculty with some insight into the teaching function and into the philosophical underpinnings of university education. In the words of John Clift, Senior Fellow of the Higher Education Research Unit at Monash University: [4]

> "In looking at the long term development in this area of teaching improvement, I believe that one not only has to provide instruction in teaching methods, but that the major task is the improvement in the general educational climate of the institution, because the improvement of teaching techniques does not necessarily result in improvement in the general educational experience being provided for the students . . ."

We come back then to the notion of self-insight and feedback. All of us would agree that the university teaching is too important to continue in neglect. Few of us can be so confident in our role as teachers that we will fail to benefit from the experience of our colleagues and students. Some faculty are already making use of such information; the others will ignore it at their peril.

[4] Personal communication, 1971.

poste à remplir

A. C. P. U.
Secrétaire Général Adjoint

Responsabilités : Devra travailler à l'association, notamment dans le domaine de la liberté académique et de la sécurité de l'emploi.

Le candidat recherché :

— Possède une expérience avec l'A.C.P.U. ou dans les associations locales ou provinciales.

— Est bilingue de préférence.

— A un rang de professeur agrégé.

Les postulants devront accompagner leur demande du nom de trois personnes à titre de référence et l'adresser au président du comité de recherche, A.C.P.U., 66 Lisgar, Ottawa K2P 0C1.

Rapport du secrétaire général

par ALWYN BERLAND

Le professeur Alwyn Berland a été Secrétaire général de l'A.C.P.U. depuis 1968. Précédemment, il était président du département d'anglais et doyen de la faculté d'Arts et Science de l'University of Saskatchewan (Regina).

Au cours de l'année écoulée, le nombre des membres de l'A.C.P.U. est passé à environ 16,500, soit une augmentation de 7.5% par rapport à l'année précédente. Avec l'adhésion de l'O.I.S.E. l'an dernier, il y a maintenant 48 associations affiliées. Il est toujours impossible d'établir le chiffre « officiel » des professeurs au Canada, mais pour autant que nous sachions, l'A.C.P.U. a recueilli l'adhésion d'entre 70 et 75% de tous les professeurs d'université admissibles. Ces chiffres se comparent très avantageusement avec ceux de notre association sœur, l'Association américaine des Professeurs d'Université, qui compte présentement 30% de tous les professeurs américains. Par le truchement de 13 associations, environ un quart de nos membres paient leur cotisation par versements mensuels.

L'an dernier, un certain nombre d'associations de professeurs se sont prononcées en faveur de l'adhésion conditionnelle, et cela représente une assez forte proportion de l'augmentation de nos membres. Je ne m'étendrai pas ici sur les mérites du système de désistement ou sur les avantages évidents qu'offrent l'accroissement de notre effectif et de nos ressources financières et le resserrement de notre solidarité.

Nous avons progressé dans un autre sens cette année, grâce à la révision de la structure fondamentale de l'A.C.P.U. et à l'adoption de nouveaux règlements lors de la réunion du Conseil en novembre, ce qui a amené l'adhésion officielle de quatre associations provinciales de professeurs. Cette révision de notre structure a exigé beaucoup de temps et de travail de la part de nombreuses personnes, aux comités, à l'Exécutif, dans les associations provinciales, au secrétariat et au Conseil. Il est encore trop tôt pour savoir comment notre travail sera influencé par ces changements, mais je suis persuadé qu'avec de la bonne volonté et de la collaboration dans nos nouveaux rapports, notre travail sera plus efficace et mieux coordonné et que les associations de professeurs à tous les niveaux d'organisation en profiteront.

Ce qui m'impressionne le plus, lorsque je regarde le travail accompli par notre Association au cours des deux dernières années, c'est la somme de directives, d'énoncés de principes et de manuels que nous avons préparés pour éclairer les professeurs canadiens. Ces documents visent des activités très variées et portent sur un grand nombre — mais sans doute pas la totalité évidemment — des préoccupations des professeurs d'université au cours des années 70. Ces deux dernières années, l'A.C.P.U. a adopté les directives ou énoncés de principes suivants:

— Directives en matière de déontologie;

— Procédures de griefs: Droits et responsabilités des professeurs et des associations locales de professeurs;

— Procédures de l'A.C.P.U. relatives à la censure;

— Énoncé de principes en matière d'annonce des postes de professeurs dans les universités canadiennes;

— Directives concernant les réductions des nominations de professeurs pour des raisons d'ordre budgétaire;

— Directives en matière de négociations salariales.

L'an dernier, nous avons modifié notre « Énoncé de principes relatif à la nomination des professeurs et à la permanence de l'emploi » dans le domaine des nominations à titre d'essai et cette année, nous avons amélioré la directive portant sur les procédures de révocation.

Une réalisation tout aussi importante a été la publication cette année du Guide de l'A.C.P.U., résultat d'un vœu fait très peu de temps après mon arrivée à l'A.C.P.U. Le Guide réunit pour la première fois de notre histoire tous nos énoncés de principes, directives et opinions générales. Il a été fort bien accueilli, notamment par des administrateurs d'universités dont beaucoup nous donnent déjà des signes encourageants qu'ils l'ont lu avec une certaine attention.

Nous avons en outre présenté des mémoires, pour le compte de l'A.C.P.U., au gouvernement fédéral sur les droits d'auteur, la nouvelle loi de l'impôt sur le revenu, l'édition au Canada et sur le rôle de la Gendarmerie royale du Canada sur les campus des universités. Nous avons présenté un mémoire à la Commission Wright de l'Ontario sur son rapport sur l'éducation post-secondaire. Nous en avons présenté un au gouvernement québécois sur les dangers d'une mainmise étrangère excessive sur les librairies et les agences de distribution. Nous avons enfin présenté au gouvernement de l'Ontario un mémoire sur l'édition du livre au Canada. Nous avons préparé à l'intention du monde universitaire, et de quiconque veut bien le lire, un document très utile intitulé: « Le petit manuel sur la Permanence. »

Parmi les services que nous offrons, il y a eu une forte augmentation du nombre des vols nolisés pour nos membres, l'élaboration de la proposition dont cette assemblée est saisie et qui prévoit un régime d'assurance-vie parrainé par l'A.C.P.U., et la publication d'un Guide de l'impôt sur le revenu grâce à la collaboration de plusieurs associations provinciales, l'U.A.P.U.O., la F.A.P.U.Q. et la C.A.F.A. Si ces normes « étranges » vous font penser au film « clockwork orange », je dois dire que je songe simplement, avec gratitude, à l'Ontario, au Québec et à l'Alberta.

A l'heure actuelle, nous nous proposons d'élaborer des directives ou des énoncés de principes sur l'évaluation des professeurs par les étudiants, les négociations collectives et les brevets. Nous examinons nos directives en matière de déontologie pour voir quelle nouvelle orientation pourrait être utile ou nécessaire dans le domaine de l'emploi secondaire. Nous préparons un contrat type pour les nominations de professeurs. Nous nous sommes entretenus avec les représentants de plusieurs autres associations professionnelles afin d'envisager les façons de recueillir de meilleures données sur la population active, notamment sur l'offre et la demande de personnel hautement qualifié.

Voilà qui donne à l'A.C.P.U. de bonne raisons de se réjouir. Pourtant, il est évident que le travail n'est jamais vraiment terminé, et il existe actuellement des problèmes qui exigent notre temps et notre réflexion, des problèmes urgents comme nous n'en avons pas connus depuis des années.

Comme il n'y a que peu de temps que nous nous sommes habitués aux idées de M. Galbraith sur la société d'abondance, nous nous trouvons, en tant qu'universitaires, dans une période de graves difficultés économiques qui ont pris par surprise beaucoup d'entre nous et de nos établissements. Parmi les problèmes directs et immédiats, on compte les réductions d'effectifs, les blocages universitaires progressifs, de grandes pressions pour augmenter la taille des classes, les tâches confiées aux professeurs et les méthodes de travail à la chaîne. Les répercussions sur l'administration des universités sont un problème peut-être moins direct, mais tout aussi urgent: la perte de l'autonomie universitaire aux mains des gouvernements et des organismes de l'État, la délégation de l'autorité dans les universités, beaucoup moins aux professeurs que ne le supposent fréquemment ceux qui ne cessent de parler de l'université « post-Duff-Berdhal », et davantage à une nouvelle classe gestionnelle: les vice-présidents administratifs, vice-présidents de la planification, vice-présidents du développement, vice-présidents du personnel, doyens, vice-doyens et doyens adjoints, adjoints administratifs et exécutifs — gestionnaires, huiles et mandarins. Cet avènement d'un nouveau mandarinat, rarement élu et rarement comptable d'une façon directe devant les conseils de professeurs, ainsi que le contrôle croissant des gouvernements sur les universités, sont deux facteurs qui selon moi contribuent à susciter un intérêt de plus en plus marqué pour les négociations collectives chez le corps professoral. Les professeurs de nombreuses universités canadiennes commencent à craindre que leur représentation accrue au sein des conseils d'administration et de divers conseils et comités de gestion ne les a nullement rapprochés des sources actuelles du pouvoir et de ce processus décisionnel capital qui imprime l'orientation des universités. Nous avons cherché pendant des années à faire appliquer la théorie du partage de l'autorité, pour ensuite constater que les citoyens du monde universitaire avec lesquels nous nous réunissons si fréquemment ont de moins en

moins d'autorité à partager. La question de savoir si les négociations collectives en bonne et due forme constituent *la* solution pour les professeurs qui assistent à une détérioration de leur situation économique et à un affaiblissement de leur autorité dans l'organisation de l'université doit faire l'objet d'une étude approfondie et prioritaire. Le Conseil a entrepris cette étude au cours de la présente assemblée, mais nous avons à peine commencé à nous attaquer à ce sujet crucial.

La condition économique précaire des professeurs suscite une prise de conscience de plus en plus grande des politiques et méthodes d'embauche dans les universités canadiennes qui se traduit par du militantisme. Un des aspects du problème concerne l'annonce de postes professoraux et administratifs, une politique que l'A.C.P.U. a préconisée pour la première fois il y a près de vingt ans et que le précurseur de l'actuelle AUCC proposait déjà en 1911, mais les instances des deux organismes n'ont guère été couronnées de succès. En 1970, le Conseil de l'A.C.P.U. a adopté une résolution plus énergique au sujet des annonces obligatoires et, en février 1971, le Comité exécutif a insisté pour que les instances académiques supérieures de chaque université canadienne rendent l'annonce de ces postes obligatoire. Ce militantisme a énormément contribué à combler l'écart entre le principe et son application, même s'il y a encore trop d'universités qui n'ont toujours pas adopté cette politique.

En révisant notre politique en matière de publications, nous avons soigneusement veillé à coordonner les dates de parution de notre nouveau périodique avec les délais importants des annonces de postes universitaires.

Toutefois, indépendamment des annonces, divers groupes préconisent d'autres mesures qui sont des manifestations plus vigoureuses d'un nouveau nationalisme ou protectionnisme et qui tirent peut-être leur origine d'une certaine conception du canadianisme, mais qui apparaissent maintenant sous les pressions exercées par la pénurie d'emplois. A mon avis, l'A.C.P.U. doit élaborer des politiques plus explicites qui feront droit aux revendications bien légitimes des universitaires canadiens d'enseigner dans les universités canadiennes, sans diminuer l'importance des qualités universitaires comme premier critère d'emploi et sans tomber dans un esprit de clocher et d'isolationnisme. L'Énoncé de principes touchant la canadianisation que le Comité exécutif a adopté en juin 1969, est encore très persuasif:

Dans la nomination d'un professeur, le premier critère de sélection a trait à la compétence du candidat au sens large, à sa capacité de remplir les obligations de la fonction décrite dans son engagement. Ainsi, l'interprétation du critère compétence déborde le sens d'engagement et de capacité du candidat à s'appliquer comme professeur et universitaire; il comporte aussi celui de posséder les qualités nécessaires à s'acquitter de ses responsabilités au sein de la communauté universitaire du Canada. Dans certains domaines où la connaissance de la réalité canadienne est essentielle, par exemple en histoire du Canada, en institutions gouvernementales ou en littérature, la compétence d'un candidat comporte cette dimension. La connaissance de certaines réalités canadiennes ne se limite pas aux seuls citoyens du Canada, quoique le Canada, comme pays de résidence et d'études, peut constituer le moyen d'apprentissage de ces connaissances. Ainsi, le directeur d'un département (par exemple d'histoire, de littérature française ou de littérature anglaise, etc.) qui ne manifeste aucune sympathie ou aucun intérêt dans l'établissement de programmes d'études canadiennes démontre une incompétence certaine en dépit de qualités universitaires réelles, de sa citoyenneté ou de son origine ethnique.

Il se peut fort bien que l'A.C.P.U., consciente de la nécessité des rapports de l'université canadienne avec la collectivité universitaire internationale ainsi qu'avec sa propre société et sa propre culture, désire affirmer que la vie intellectuelle du monde universitaire est mieux servie en cultivant délibérément le pluralisme dans les diverses écoles de pensée, méthodes critiques, méthodologies et perspectives. Les universités canadiennes se doivent d'appuyer ce pluralisme, mais, dans ce cadre, doit veiller à ce qu'une certaine teneur canadienne, tant au niveau des cours que des fins de la recherche, soit respectée.

A ces fins, j'estime que les qualités et la compétence universitaires doivent avoir la plus haute importance lors de l'étude des nouvelles nominations et du renouvellement des nominations à l'essai ou d'autres nominations non permanentes. Les considérations de race, de sexe, de religion, de citoyenneté ou d'origine nationale qui sont considérées comme pertinentes pour certains postes doivent recevoir l'accord officiel des professeurs sur les politiques générales appropriées, et ces politiques doivent respecter la législation sur les droits de l'homme et l'égalité des chances.

La dernière conséquence de la situation maintenant plus précaire des professeurs que je voudrais commenter a trait au travail effectué par l'A.C.P.U. dans le domaine des conditions de nomination et de la liberté universitaire. Le président du Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi vous fera son rapport sur des activités qui continuent à exiger une grande partie de notre temps et de nos ressources. Je voudrais parler ici d'un seul problème au sujet duquel, à mon sens, l'A.C.P.U. et ses associations affiliées devraient élaborer une politique plus énergique.

Nous avons une liste d'administrations censurées que beaucoup d'entre nous trouvent très inquiétante. Nous ne sommes pas habitués, et peut-être pas résignés, à voir 4 ou 5 administrations sous le coup de notre désapprobation officielle. On retrouve la même inquiétude aux États-Unis. A l'assemblée annuelle de l'A.A.U.P. à laquelle j'ai assisté au début du mois, on a exprimé beaucoup d'inquiétude au sujet du fait que

la liste de cette Association comptait maintenant 28 administrations censurées, soit le chiffre le plus élevé de toute son histoire.

L'an dernier, le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi et le secrétariat ont travaillé plus fort que jamais pour prévenir de graves problèmes en intervenant immédiatement au moyen de lettres, d'appels téléphoniques et de visites personnelles dans l'espoir d'éviter l'aggravation des cas les plus importants. En outre, un certain nombre de cas sérieux ont pu être résolus grâce à une action dynamique de la part de bonnes associations locales. Nous croyons avoir obtenu d'assez bons résultats, bien que ces initiatives aient énormément taxé nos ressources. Il reste à voir si nous continuerons à être aussi efficaces. Il est fort possible que nous ayons à trouver des moyens autres que la censure pour régler les cas très graves, mais aucun d'entre nous ne sait avec exactitude quelles pourraient être ces solutions de rechange. Pendant que nos recherches continuent, je crois que nous devons aborder une autre question, à savoir la prévention de la censure par rapport à son application.

Qu'est-ce qui mène à la possibilité de censure ? Tout d'abord, lorsque des mesures ou procédures irrégulières concernant les conditions de nomination des professeurs n'ont pu être corrigées au moyen de discussions, de négociations ou de médiation — ce que Jim Milner appelait l'appel à la raison.

L'A.C.P.U. a alors recours aux pressions publiques ou politiques en faisant par exemple de la publicité au moyen de communiqués ou en diffusant un rapport d'enquête. Si cette publicité ne donne pas de résultats, l'A.C.P.U. envisage une autre méthode, c'est-à-dire la menace de censure. L'atteinte de ce stade peut s'expliquer de deux façons:

a) l'université peut prétendre qu'elle a agi correctement suivant des normes acceptables pour le monde universitaire en général et qu'elle n'a donc nullement l'intention ou le désir de revenir sur une décision qu'elle estime justifiée;

b) l'université peut prétendre qu'elle a agi correctement suivant des normes qu'elle a fixées elle-même et qui sont considérées comme étant aussi valables ou meilleures que celles qui existent dans le monde universitaire; ou qui, même si elles ne sont pas aussi valables, ont une valeur légale suffisante pour justifier le rejet d'autres normes.

De ces deux positions, la première — à savoir que l'université a agi correctement suivant des normes acceptables pour le monde universitaire — a été rejetée par le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi qui a recommandé au Comité exécutif que l'A.C.P.U. agisse, et par le Comité exécutif qui a accepté cette recommandation. Bien entendu, la prise du vote de censure signifie que le Conseil l'a également rejetée.

Quand à la deuxième position — à savoir que l'université demeure persuadée que ses procédures étaient satisfaisantes, soit par leur valeur intrinsèque, soit par leur valeur légale, même si elles diffèrent de quelque façon des normes acceptables pour le monde universitaire en général, comme par exemple celles qui figurent dans l'Énoncé de principes relatif à la nomination des professeurs et à la permanence de l'emploi — il s'agit là de la situation qui doit continuer à préoccuper l'A.C.P.U. et plus particulièrement le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi.

Tout cela peut vous paraître assez évident, mais c'est une introduction nécessaire à l'étude d'un problème important. Il s'agit du statut ou de la compétence de l'Énoncé de principes de l'A.C.P.U. dans son application aux griefs dans les diverses universités. Lorsque tout va bien, le professeur, l'association de professeurs et l'A.C.P.U. reconnaissent cette compétence et il est très souvent possible d'en arriver à un accord avec l'administration, tout au moins en prenant d'abord des palliatifs, et en finissant par adopter des règlements locaux qui vont dans le sens de notre Énoncé de principes. L'an dernier, on a ainsi réglé à l'amiable des cas qui auraient pu devenir très litigieux à Waterloo Lutheran, par exemple, et à St. Mary's.

Il se peut toutefois que tout n'aille *pas* pour le mieux, comme dans l'un des exemples suivants:

i) l'administration peut continuer à refuser de reconnaître la validité ou la compétence de notre Énoncé de principes, même si l'association des professeurs la reconnaît;

ii) une partie importante de l'association des professeurs, de même que l'administration, peuvent refuser d'admettre l'application des normes de l'A.C.P.U. à un certain grief, pour l'une de deux raisons:

   a) l'association locale peut refuser d'appuyer la politique de l'A.C.P.U. parce que les règlements locaux sont moins énergiques ou contradictoires ou qu'ils demeurent muets sur les procédures que nous avons condamnées;

   b) l'association locale peut estimer que même si les politiques de l'A.C.P.U. sont valables en principe, le grief en cause n'est pas suffisamment fondé pour qu'on insiste sur leur application.

Or, le fait que la très grande majorité des cas dont le Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi est saisi sont réglés sans publicité, sans compter la censure, donne à entendre que les contradictions regrettables que je viens de mentionner ne sont pas nombreuses. Cette année, le Comité a étudié 103 cas. Il se produit cependant de telles contradictions et elles ont parfois des conséquences pénibles pour le professeur dont l'appel devient l'objet d'un litige non seulement entre lui-même et l'administration,

mais encore entre sa propre association de professeurs et l'A.C.P.U. auprès de laquelle il a interjeté appel.

Le mandat général du Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi est de s'occuper des griefs ou appels provoqués par des conditions qui, d'après les principes adoptés par l'A.C.P.U., compromettent la liberté universitaire et la permanence de l'emploi. Le Comité doit appuyer les Énoncés de principes de l'Association. En ce faisant, il tient compte des particularités locales, à condition qu'elles n'impliquent pas des normes de justice ou d'équité qui sont beaucoup plus basses que celles prévues dans nos Énoncés de principes.

Par conséquent, je crois que les associations locales doivent faire un choix: soit, premièrement, veiller à ce que les règlements locaux soient conformes aux Énoncés de principes de l'A.C.P.U. et, dans le cas contraire, s'engager à appuyer les politiques de l'A.C.P.U. dans les griefs individuels où on a négligé ou transgressé ces politiques, ou, deuxièmement, réviser le mandat actuel du Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi de manière à l'empêcher d'intervenir dans les cas où les règlements locaux n'ont pas été formellement enfreints, même s'ils sont contraires aux politiques et aux principes de l'A.C.P.U.

Ce serait folie de vouloir prétendre que ces deux partis qui s'offrent à notre choix sont également séduisants, ou même possibles. A mon avis, le deuxième serait désastreux pour la liberté universitaire au Canada. Les associations affiliées doivent néanmoins y songer plus sérieusement et opter pour l'un ou pour l'autre. Le travail du Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi est trop exigeant et trop important pour être entravé par de sérieuses ambiguïtés sous le rapport de la compétence. Il est déjà assez difficile pour l'Association de se faire dire par des administrateurs qu'ils ne se sentent liés que par les règlements locaux, quels que soient leur origine et leur bien-fondé. Cette difficulté ne doit pas être encore accentuée par l'association locale des professeurs qui vient parfois nous dire qu'elle partage leur opinion.

J'ai bien l'impression que je viens de prêcher les (largement) convertis. Si tel est le cas, je demande quand même aux convertis de nous aider à ramener les brebis égarées au bercail ou tout au moins à leur faire entendre la voix de la sagesse. Ce que je veux dire par là, pour parler moins prétentieusement, c'est que le Conseil doit envisager le besoin d'affirmer catégoriquement la primauté des Énoncés de principes de l'A.C.P.U. lorsqu'à notre avis, les règlements locaux ne protègent pas convenablement la liberté universitaire des professeurs, ou n'offrent pas de garantie suffisante d'un traitement juste et équitable.

Je conclus par certaines remarques sur le secrétariat. Pendant la majeure partie de la dernière année universitaire, nous avons pu profiter des services extrêmement précieux du professeur Joe Scanlon comme assistant secrétaire général. Joe a obtenu un congé de l'Université Carleton, et il s'est reposé en travaillant 70 heures par semaine pour l'A.C.P.U. En plus d'avoir fait preuve d'une merveilleuse ingéniosité pour nous obtenir une foule de nouveaux vols nolisés, un nouveau régime collectif d'assurance-vie et des escomptes pour les locations d'automobiles, il a énormément contribué à remettre de la cohérence dans un système comptable qui était dans un état presque désespéré après quatre ans de tripotage — une expression que je préfère au terme non moins obscène mais plus formel de *défalcation.* Quoi qu'il en soit, je pense que Joe a été une bénédiction du ciel et que nous lui sommes tous redevables . . . moralement, j'entends !

Le nouvel assistant secrétaire général, que nous venons tout juste de nommer, est M. Pierre Leahey qui entrera en fonction en juin. Il nous arrive du gouvernement fédéral et il a également déjà travaillé à l'Université de Sherbrooke et à la Conférence des recteurs et des directeurs d'école du Québec.

Nous avons perdu notre directrice de l'information, Linda Mitchell, qui a démissionné principalement pour des raisons de santé et de famille, et elle a droit à notre estime et à notre reconnaissance, surtout pour avoir lancé le *Communiqué,* une publication qui connaît beaucoup de succès; nous perdons aussi à regret notre chargé de recherches, Bertrand Dionne, qui n'a pu résister aux attraits de Montréal. Notre dernière perte, mais certainement par la moindre, est celle d'Elizabeth Peters dont le mari a été affecté en dehors d'Ottawa par l'armée canadienne — et ce seul fait me convaine de la sagesse du pacifisme. Elizabeth a été ma secrétaire, et plus récemment directrice de notre bureau, ainsi que secrétaire du Conseil et du Comité exécutif. C'est une des tenantes des buts et objectifs de l'A.C.P.U. les plus fidèles et les plus passionnées que je connaisse.

Don Savage, qui est secrétaire du Comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi et qui fait aussi une pléthore d'autres choses, toutes bien et inlassablement, reste avec nous, tout comme Velma Reid, la doyenne du personnel de l'A.C.P.U. Pour tous ces services, merci du fond du cœur.

C'est la dernière fois que je m'adresse à une assemblée régulière du Conseil en qualité de secrétaire général. Qu'il me soit donc permis de vous dire que pendant mon séjour à l'A.C.P.U., j'ai rencontré plus d'universitaires dévoués et de gens merveilleux que je ne l'espérais et c'est ce qui m'a soutenu pendant les périodes difficiles que le secrétariat d'un organisme comme le nôtre connaît parfois. Comme je serai à l'A.C.P.U. jusqu'à la fin de décembre, tout cela peut vous paraître prématuré. Vous pouvez être sûrs que j'ai bien l'intention de continuer, et si l'on s'attend à ce que je me conduise comme un canard boiteux, on devra d'abord m'abattre.

C.A.U.T.
A.C.P.U.
newsletter

Loyola, Sir George Merge

On 21 September the boards of Sir George Williams University and of Loyola College made public a draft merger agreement which would create one university with five faculties — university faculties of commerce and of engineering which would combine the offerings of the two institutions, Sir George Williams faculties of arts and of science, and a Loyola faculty offering majors and honours in arts and a major in science. This plan is to be reviewed by the boards in October. The boards expect to present a proposal to the Quebec government in the same month. Highly placed sources in Quebec City indicated that the Minister of Education hopes to make the arrangements final by Christmas. These announcements followed a summer of contention concerning the future of Loyola. In early July the Conseil des universités, an advisory committee to Quebec's Minister of Education, issued a report on the future of English-language higher education. The report, which was leaked to the **Montreal Star,** found that owing to demographic reasons there would be within a decade a surplus of some 8,000 student places in the anglophone institutions in Montreal, and as a consequence it recommended that Loyola cease to offer university-level work by 1975 and suggested that it might become an English-language CEGEP or a junior college.

The report broke on the scene in the middle of the discussions between Loyola and Sir George Williams, which were expected to lead to a merger in the near future. These talks had begun in 1969 but had become more serious in the last academic year when the boards of governors publicly announced agreement in principle to a merger on an eleven-point programme which would involve the creation of a new university with a new charter.

The report seemed likely to put these negotiations into jeopardy. The **Montreal Star** quoted an anonymous administrator at Sir George Williams as saying that the negotiations "as two equal partners" would no longer be possible. "After all, if Loyola is not going to be able to bring its campus to the negotiating table, then it has nothing much to offer has it?"

A good deal of sniping also broke out between the anglophone universities over the genesis of the report. The Conseil is composed, among others, of a representative of each university but Loyola is not a member since it does not have a charter and its students receive the degrees of the Université de Montréal. Father Malone, Loyola's President, denounced the role of McGill in the creation of the report. He alleged that McGill, without consulting Loyola, had made representations to the Conseil recommending that Loyola become a CEGEP and that all anglophone university work be done by McGill and Sir George. Principal Robert Bell of McGill denied these allegations. Others angrily denounced the fact that the two Protestant universities would survive, but not the only Catholic university serving the English community.

Loyola received support not only from the English press but also from Claude Ryan in **Le Devoir** who favoured the continuation of the College and suggested that the axe should fall on Bishop's and certain programmes at Sir George and McGill. The authorities at McGill, he wrote, "ont le don de veiller jalousement à leurs intérêts tout en se donnant l'air de se préoccuper du bien général".

In defending the rights of the College, the administration tended to place primary emphasis on its Catholic character. They also stated that, while the general demographic forecasts of the report might be accurate, Loyola with 4,000 full-time day students, was nonetheless attracting undergraduates more rapidly than McGill or Sir George. The faculty association, as well as the administration, also argued Loyola's right to exist simply from history, namely that Loyola had created over 70 years a viable undergraduate programme, that it had a certain distinctive character of its own as a consequence of these traditions, that it had served the community for many years, and that it should not be dealt with as though none of this mattered in the face of the bureaucrats' slide rules.

Most of the public discussion revolved around the differences among the anglophone institutions. However, the **Montreal Star** noted another aspect, the future of the faculty at Loyola. The report had recommended, in this regard, that "the College, when planning its future orientation, undertake the task of reassigning personnel according to its existing commitments towards staff". The **Star** correspondent found this glib, superficial and an affront, presumably because the College, having ceased to exist, would not likely be in a position to do anything for its staff other than to put them on the street.

The Minister, Dr. Cloutier, maintained a low profile through the public uproar. He denounced the "malencontreuse fuite" which had led to the publication of the report. He stated that there was "no reason for anyone to get overly concerned". He pointed out that the Conseil was a purely advisory body and that he was not obliged to accept its advice "même s'il lui accorde l'importance qu'il mérite". Although he was under some pressure from the Parti Québécois to accept the report, he neither accepted nor rejected it although his actions appeared to suggest that he hoped the report would accelerate the negotiations between Loyola and Sir George, thus creating a fait accompli. In August the government added two representatives of its own to the negotiating committee and the agreement appears to have been reached at the next meeting in September.

EDITORIAL

I hope that you will welcome the C.A.U.T. **Bulletin** in its new format, celebrate its newness, note its continuity with the old, and like the combination of innovation with tradition.

The first publications of the C.A.U.T. were the infamous salary sheets devised in the early 1950s as the only means by which professors could hear of the economic status of the profession across Canada. That of course was long before D.B.S. began collecting salary information (largely at the urging of C.A.U.T.). The salary sheets — regarded in their time as subversive, if not merely excessively union-like, by many university administrators — led to mimeographed bulletins distributed twice a year, and then, in the fulness and richness of time, to the first printed Bulletin (labelled Volume 4, Number 1), published in May 1956 as the only **Bulletin** of the year.

Through the years the **Bulletin** served as house-organ, as vehicle for the distribution of C.A.U.T. policy statements and guidelines, news of committees and of Council meetings, of reports on major cases involving academic freedom and tenure, of articles on issues of interest to faculties and faculty associations, of book reviews and, sometimes, of correspondence, usually irate.

In 1970 C.A.U.T. added to its publications a Newsletter, published 6 to 8 times a year, featuring more topical materials — news stories, reports, account of association activities across the country. The Newsletter proved to be popular and well read and, together with the **Bulletin,** provided members with what we thought to be fairly good communications with and about the C.A.U.T. Through these years, however, we were plagued always with a double problem of mailing and distribution : of the very high costs of direct mailing, and the frequent great delays at some universities of distribution of publications which had been shipped in bulk to the local association office.

It was largely in an attempt to deal with the need for more rapid production and distribution that the Executive agreed this year to change the policy and format of our publications, the first result of which is now before you.

Essentially, we have decided to retain the basic features of the Bulletin and the Newsletter, but to combine them into a single publication six times a year. Each **Bulletin** will contain a news insert, copy deadlines for which are much shorter than for the main body of the magazine. The main body of the **Bulletin** will continue to feature official C.A.U.T. reports and documents, and articles on issues of ongoing interest to our members. The news insert will feature stories, news of the activities of some of our committees, of provincial associations, and local news that is of interest to members elsewhere, and (God willing) academic vacancies.

The savings in production costs of the new periodical will make possible a semi-direct system of mailing. Copies of the **Bulletin** will be addressed individually to our members, and shipped in bulk to the mail-rooms of each university for direct distribution. We experimented with this technique in the distribution of the first C.A.U.T. **Handbook,** with results which in the main we, and our members, found very gratifying.

We want the **Bulletin** to continue to be our house-organ, but a good deal more than that. We hope to use its pages as a vehicle for discussion on academic issues, whether in the form of single articles or symposia, articles which we hope will stimulate thought and debate — and response — even though they do not necessarily represent the official positions of the C.A.U.T. And we hope to keep our news insert — **C.A.U.T.-A.C.P.U. 1972** — timely and informative. All of that sounds demanding, ambitious, and indeed, why shouldn't it be?

Alwyn Berland
Executive Secretary

VACANCIES

Department of Psychology

University of British Columbia

8 positions for July 1, 1973 — 2 full (including 1 visiting full), 3 associates and 3 assistant professors. 2 positions in clinical, one in social, one in applied; other positions open to outstanding candidates in any area. Department of 36, M.A. and Ph.D. program in most areas. Salary competitive and negotiable; favorable retirement, medical and disability pensions. Send complete **vitæ,** representative reprints and names of three professional references to : Chairman, Faculty Search Committee, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE
ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT

A vacancy exists for either

a **Food Processor**

or a **Food Engineer**

in the above department.

Responsibilities will include the general supervision of the combined area of Food Processing and Food Engineering in addition to teaching undergraduates and graduate courses in one or both of these areas and supervising research and graduate students. Experience and the Ph.D. are highly desirable. Salary will be related to qualifications and experience. The 1972-73 salary scales at the University of Alberta are :

Assistant Professor	$11,855 - $15,535
Associate Professor	$15,585 - $20,665
Professor	$20,715 - up

The vacancy may be filled in September 1972 or later by arrangement.

Detailed applications including qualifications, experience, a list of publications and the names of three referees should be forwarded to L.F.L. Clegg, Chairman, Department of Food Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E1, Canada. Further details available on request.

Alberta Universities — how canadian are they?

M. E. McKISSOCK

The "Moir Report", based on public hearings conducted throughout the province under the chairmanship of Arnold F. Moir, is officially titled **Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Non-Canadian Influence in Alberta Post-Secondary Education.** 'Non-Canadian influence' refers not only to the number of foreign staff members, but also to course content.

The basic principle of post-secondary education, as set forth in the report, is as follows : "Fences between nations and peoples can be followed by fences between states or provinces, fences then between regions and cities, and then between classes, religions, and other groups. Parochialism is pernicious and shortsighted to both mankind and the tiniest village; to a university it is fatal. It is also true that the neglect of local gardens in the interest of distant pastures is a disservice to the nation and the world of knowledge."

In its studies the committee found that the amount of non-Canadian influence was more significant at universities than at other post-secondary institutions. Figures on the citizenship of the academic staff (all full-time members of teaching and administrative staff of a rank of lecturer or higher eligible for permanent appointment) show that 40% are non-Canadian at the University of Alberta; 55% at the University of Calgary; and 43% at the University of Lethbridge.

Broken down according to discipline, the percentage of non-Canadian academic staff is as follows : Agriculture 34.8%; Arts 60.9%; Commerce 48.4%; Education 36.7%; Engineering 33.8%; Medicine, Dentistry, and Nursing 30%; Physical Education 19.4%; Science 56.2%; and others 23.9%.

Research also showed that academic administrative positions at the universities were held by a substantial number of non-Canadians : University of Alberta 23%; University of Calgary 37%; and University of Lethbridge 31%.

The percentages were substantially lower at the public colleges in the province : Grande Prairie 7.7%; Lethbridge 10.7%; Medicine Hat 27%; Mount Royal 22.8%; and Red Deer 11.3%.

Canadian universities have been importing professors ever since the universities were established, but it was not until after World War II that large numbers of non-Canadian staff were hired. There were three important reasons for the increase. First, the demand for higher education skyrocketed after the war, and Canada was faced with an insufficient supply of qualified staff. Also, Canada had for years been sending her students, many of whom enjoyed foreign scholarships, to other countries for their training; in return, she was asked to open her universities to foreign students and provide scholarships open for international competition. The third reason was the fact that the increased demand caused expansion within most of the academic disciplines, creating areas of interest that were international in scope. These changes, says the report, were "thrust on the universities, not only by events, but also by the massive and insistent demands of governments and the public".

Although this expansion lasted almost 20 years, "the foreign-born professors in the universities did not deprive worthy Canadians of jobs. They came when Canada desperately needed them, at Canada's invitation, with Canada's welcome, and they performed incalculable service to Canada. It would be a mark of the grossest ingratitude and bad manners for Canadians now to do anything to make them feel unwelcome or to label them as second-class citizens. Many of them are now Canadians, and there is no indication that the value of one's citizenship is determined by its length. Most statistics which indicate proportions of Canadian and non-Canadian staff show a situation which was planned and encouraged by the governments and people of Canada, and to suggest loudly for the world to hear that it is somehow a terrible thing, disloyal to Canada, is both unfair and untrue."

The report concedes, however, that 1968 marked the turning point in the Canadian attitude toward non-Canadian influence. That year, and those since, was characterized by rising unemployment among the nation's scholars. Is the hiring of non-Canadians depriving Canadians of jobs? If so, asks the report, what should be done about it? A summary of the committee's findings and recommendations follows :

1. Under the Universities Act, the Board of Governors has the authority to appoint high administrative officers, such as presidents, vice-presidents, and deans. The Board includes residents of the province and graduates of its institutions. "More than 70 per cent of the high administrative positions are now occupied by Canadians. The committee recognizes the value of having Canadians in these posts, but it rejects the proposal that a non-Canadian ought not to be appointed. The existing machinery appears satisfactory and no change is recommended."

2. Department heads, both elected and appointed, should be selected on the basis of qualifications, interest, and abilities, which include an appreciation of Canadian interests where relevant. There is no conclusive evidence of "old boy networks" in which non-Canadians fill vacancies in their departments by hiring from their alma maters.

3. Selection committees should include people from within and without the department involved, as well as students. The members should be aware of the requirements of the discipline concerned and of the availability of personnel within Canada.

4. Quotas on the number of non-Canadian staff should not be imposed, nor should there be watchdog committees to screen appointments to the academic staff. Granting of tenure should not be limited to Canadian citizens.

5. Vacancies should be advertised in Canadian journals and periodicals, as well as foreign, before they are filled.

6. Competence must be the main criterion in university recruitment and appointment. If a Canadian and a non-Canadian are equally qualified, preference should be given to the Canadian. Competence should also be the governing factor when granting promotions, increments, and tenure. In making appointments to junior positions where no experience is required, Canadians should be given preference over equally-qualified non-Canadians.

7. Conflicting opinions on the amount of Canadian course content indicate that curriculum committees, department heads, and deans must do more to make certain that Canadian content is not ignored.

8. The unfair income tax advantage that non-Canodians have over Canadians must be stopped. At present, non Canadians can enter the country as landed immigrants, stay in Canada, and for a period of two years claim and receive tax exemption on the grounds that they are visiting professors. The committee re-

Le bulletin est mort vive le bulletin

J'espère que vous ferez bon accueil au **Bulletin** de l'A.C.P.U. sous son nouveau format, que vous célébrerez sa nouveauté et noterez sa continuité avec l'ancien, et que vous aimerez la combinaison de l'innovation et de la tradition.

Les premières publications de l'A.C.P.U. furent les échelles de salaires, de triste mémoire, au début des années 50 et elles étaient alors le seul moyen d'informer les professeurs de la situation économique de la profession d'un océan à l'autre. Bien entendu, c'était bien avant que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique ne commence à recueillir des données sur les salaires (grâce, en grande partie, aux instances de l'A.C.P.U.). Ces échelles de salaires qui, à l'époque, étaient considérées par bien des administrateurs d'université comme subversives, voire même excessivement syndicalistes, furent remplacées par des bulletins polycopiés qui paraissaient deux fois par an, puis, avec le temps, par le premier Bulletin imprimé (marqué Volume 4, numéro 1), publié en mai 1956 et qui était le seul **Bulletin** de l'année.

Dès l'année universitaire 1958-1959, le Bulletin paraissait quatre fois par an, sous une couverture blanche. En 1963, il adoptait une couverture jaune vif, présentation qu'il conserva jusqu'en 1968. Cette année-là, l'A.C.P.U. arrêta son choix sur une publication plus luxueuse, avec un dos solide (rigide, aux dires de certains) et une couverture blanche et brune.

Au fil des ans, le **Bulletin** a été notre organe officiel et a permis de diffuser les énoncés de principes et les directives de l'A.C.P.U., des nouvelles sur les réunions du Conseil et des comités, des rapports sur des cas importants mettant en cause la liberté universitaire et la permanence de l'emploi, des articles sur des questions intéressant les professeurs et les associations de professeurs, des comptes rendus de divers ouvrages, et parfois de la correspondance, en général des lettres courroucées.

En 1970, l'A.C.P.U. a lancé une nouvelle publication, le Communiqué, qui paraît de 6 à 8 fois par an et qui contient davantage d'articles sur des sujets d'intérêt courant — nouvelles, rapports, comptes rendus des activités des associations dans tout le Canada. Le Communiqué a été bien accueilli et, de concert avec le **Bulletin,** il a fourni aux membres de l'Association d'assez bons moyens de communication, croyons-nous, avec l'A.C.P.U. Au cours de toutes ces années, cependant, nous avons été aux prises avec un double problème d'expédition postale et de distribution, c'est-à-dire le coût très élevé de l'expédition directe, et les retards longs et fréquents à certaines universités dans la distribution des publications qui avaient été expédiées en grosses quantités au secrétariat de l'association locale.

C'est surtout dans le but d'accélérer la publication et la diffusion que le Comité exécutif a convenu cette année de modifier la politique relative à nos publications ainsi que leur présentation, et vous avez les premiers résultats de cette initiative entre les mains.

Essentiellement, nous avons décidé de conserver les principales caractéristiques du Bulletin et du Communiqué, mais de les réunir dans une seule publication qui paraîtra six fois par an. Chaque **Bulletin** contiendra des communiqués pour lesquels les échéances seront beaucoup plus courtes que pour le reste de la publication. Le corps du **Bulletin** comprendra encore des rapports et documents officiels de l'A.C.P.U. ainsi que des articles sur des questions d'intérêt courant pour nos membres. On pourra compter parmi les communiqués des articles, des nouvelles des travaux de certains de nos comités, des associations provinciales, des nouvelles locales qui intéressent certains membres et, s'il plaît à Dieu, des avis de vacances.

Les économies réalisées dans les coûts de publication du nouveau périodique permettront d'instaurer un système d'expédition semi-directe. Les **Bulletins** seront adressés à chaque membre, puis expédiés en grosses quantités aux salles de courrier des universités d'où ils seront alors distribués directement. Nous avons essayé cette technique pour distribuer le premier **Guide** de l'A.C.P.U., avec des résultats qui, dans l'ensemble, sont très satisfaisants, à notre avis et de celui de nos membres.

Nous voulons que le **Bulletin** demeure notre organe officiel, mais nous voulons aussi qu'il soit beaucoup plus que cela. Nous espérons qu'il servira de véhicule de discussion sur des questions universitaires, qu'il s'agisse de simples articles ou de recueils d'articles, exposés qui, nous le souhaitons, favoriseront la réflexion et le débat — sans compter les réactions — même s'ils ne représentent pas forcément les positions officielles de l'A.C.P.U. Nous espérons par ailleurs que nos nouvelles — **C.A.U.T.-A.C.P.U. 1972** — seront toujours opportunes et instructives. Voilà qui est bien exigeant et ambitieux ! Et pourquoi pas ?

Alwyn Berland
Secrétaire général

(Cont'd from p. 3)

commends "that the tax concession be granted only to real visiting professors and that it not be used as an inducement for non-Canadians to come to Canada and get more spendable dollars from a job."

9. "In the faculties of Engineering, Education, Nursing, and Medicine the staff is predominantly Canadian. In the humanities and social sciences the percentage of Canadians holding academic positions drops dramatically, and in some departments the percentage of Canadians is below thirty. In some disciplines there have been few Canadian graduates from Canadian universities and it is apparent that if we are to have more Canadians in our universities we must develop these disciplines and attract competent Canadian students."

10. "In the selection of graduate students the committee recommends that, while academic qualifications must be the major concern, there should also be a fair, reasonable, and effective preference for qualified Canadian students."

11. To satisfy the public that they have adopted the practices recommended in mony of the submissions made at the hearings, universities must, in their annual reports, publish their recruitment and appointment procedures and report on the number of Canadian and non-Canadian appointees. Universities also should indicate what they have done to ensure Canadian content in courses where it is relevant.

12. Although evidence of a shortage was not conclusive, the committee did encounter considerable discussion regarding the shortage of Canadian material in some fields and an inability to get high-quality Canadian works published. The commission therefore recommended a careful study of the need for, and economic feasibility of, a Western University Press.

The Moir Report stresses the point thot government interference in any problems that might exist is not the answer, stating it is up to the institutions to implement the committee's recommendations.

C.A.U.T. GROUP AND CHARTER FLIGHTS

1973 GROUP FLIGHTS

MONTREAL/LONDON/MONTREAL

April 29 (Sun.) - June 29 (Fri.)	$204.00 *
May 6 (Sun.) - Aug. 31 (Fri.)	$204.00
May 27 (Sun.) - Sept. 3 (Mon.)	$204.00
June 10 (Sun.) - July 9 (Mon.)	$277.00
July 1 (Sun.) - Aug. 31 (Fri.)	$277.00
July 15 (Sun.) - Aug. 6 (Mon.)	$277.00
Aug. 5 (Sun.) - Sept. 3 (Mon.)	$277.00

TORONTO/LONDON/TORONTO

May 1 (Tue.) - Aug. 24 (Fri.)	$222.00 **
May 20 (Sun.) - July 20 (Fri.)	$222.00
May 30 (Wed.) - Aug. 31 (Fri.)	$222.00
July 8 (Sun.) - July 23 (Mon.)	$296.00
Aug. 26 (Sun.) - Sept. 7 (Fri.)	$296.00

* adult fare, children 2-11 years 50%, infants 10% — ** infants 10% of Montreal fare

1973 CHARTER FLIGHTS
TORONTO/LONDON/TORONTO

ONE WAY EASTBOUND

May 4 (Fri.)	$104.00 per seat
May 25 (Fri.)	$104.00 " "
June 30 (Sat.)	$122.50 " "
July 28 (Sat.)	$122.50 " "
Aug. 25 (Sat.)	$112.50 " "

ONE WAY WESTBOUND

July 30 (Mon.)	$112.00 per seat
Aug. 17 (Fri.)	$112.00 " "
Aug. 24 (Fri.)	$112.00 " "
Sept. 1 (Sat.)	$112.00 " "

WESTERN CANADA CHARTERS

WINNIPEG/LONDON/WINNIPEG

May 25 (Fri.) - Aug. 24 (Fri.)	$211.00 *
June 30 (Sat.) - Sept. 1 (Sat.)	$252.00

In the event of charter aircraft not filling, members will travel under the Group-40 tariff at applicable additional fare

EDMONTON/CALGARY to LONDON return

May 25 (Fri.) - Aug. 24 (Fri.)	$234.00 *
June 30 (Sat.) - Sept. 1 (Sat.)	$279.00

Calgary passengers will be charged $20.00 more than Edmonton passengers
* seasonal per seat rate

MARITIMES GROUP FLIGHTS

HALIFAX/LONDON/HALIFAX

May 27 (Sun.) - Aug. 24 (Fri.)	$185.00 adult	Shoulder Season (children 50%, infants 10%)
July 15 (Sun.) - Aug. 6 (Mon.)	$259.00 adult	High Season (children 50%, infants 10%)

CONTINENTAL POINTS

Montreal/Amsterdam	Shoulder Season :	$214.00	High Season :	$289.00	}	All Group-40 fares
Frankfurt	" "	$225.00	" "	$299.00	}	
Paris	" "	$214.00	" "	$289.00	}	
Rome	" "	$294.00	" "	$358.00	}	

Shoulder Season : April/May/September/October; High Season : June/July/August
Eastbaund travel date determines the round trip fare

Group and Charter travel conditions as outlined in 1972 C.A.U.T. Programme

Information : Finlay Travel Ltd., P.O. Box 83,
Toronto Dominion Centre, Toronto 111. Tel. : (416) 366-4936.

These prices are subject to change

Other flights to London during Christmas ($155.)

CAUT·ACPU
canadian association of university teachers
association canadienne des professeurs d'université

September 29, 1972

To all members:

At its meeting in Vancouver last May, the C.A.U.T. Council unanimously approved a plan of voluntary group life insurance for its members.

It is a pleasure to advise you that this plan is now available to you and to all other members of the C.A.U.T. under a master agreement with The Prudential Insurance Company.

The enclosed brochure describes the benefits and offers you a chance to participate in the plan. The question of whether you choose to participate is entirely one for you, personally to decide. However, I hope you will read the material carefully because the plan has been prepared only after a great deal of work by many persons within our association.

The present offer is for term life for yourself and for your dependents. At a later date, should it seem appropriate, we expect to offer additional coverage.

We would have liked to have offered a plan which would have guaranteed coverage to every C.A.U.T. member who applied. However, to avoid exceptionally high rates, we have had to set some limits in what is, after all, a purely voluntary plan. The insurance company has agreed, however, to accept persons who might be considered above normal risk. Still, some persons inevitably will find that their applications are rejected. If this does happen, they should not consider themselves forever uninsurable through C.A.U.T. We have an agreement with our insurance consultants, James P. Howell & Associates, and The Prudential Insurance Company, that, if the response justifies it, we will make every attempt to extend the plan to others now not insured. All applications will be held on file with our administrators, Kanatia Consulting & Administration Incorporated, and applicants will be automatically reviewed if the plan is extended. Of course, all information will be held in strictest confidence.

Sincerly yours,

Charles C. Bigelow.

C.C. Bigelow
President

66 Lisgar, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C1 • (613) 237-6885

Telex 013-3549

CAUT·ACPU
canadian association of university teachers
association canadienne des professeurs d'université

Le 29 septembre, 1972

A tous les membres:

Lors de sa réunion à Vancouver en mai dernier, le Conseil de l'A.C.P.U. a approuvé à l'unanimité une combinaison d'assurance collective que ses membres pourraient souscrire à titre facultatif.

Nous sommes heureux de porter à votre connaissance que vous, ainsi que tous les autres membres de l'A.C.P.U., pouvez maintenant bénéficier de la combinaison d'assurance en question.

La brochure ci-jointe décrit les prestations procurées et vous offre la possibilité de participer à la combinaison d'assurance. C'est à vous, personnellement, de décider si vous voulez y souscrire ou non. J'espère, toutefois, que vous lirez très attentivement les documents qui vous sont soumis, étant donné que la combinaison en question représente le produit d'un travail long et sérieux effectué par plusieurs personnes qui font partie de notre association.

L'offre actuelle consiste en une assurance vie temporaire à souscrire sur votre tête et sur celle des personnes à votre charge. A une date ultérieure, si nous pensons qu'il y a lieu de le faire, il nous serait possible d'offrir une protection complémentaire.

Nous aurions voulu offrir une combinaison qui aurait garanti une protection d'assurance à chaque membre de l'A.C.P.U. qui en fait la demande. Cependant, afin d'éviter d'avoir à payer un tarif exceptionnellement élevé, nous avons dû fixer des limites à une assurance qui n'est souscrite, après tout, qu'à titre purement facultatif. Notre assureur, La Prudentielle, a convenu, toutefois, d'accepter les personnes qui pourraient être considérées comme étant au-dessus du risque normal. Malgré cela, inévitablement, quelques personnes verront leur proposition d'assurance faire l'objet d'un refus. Si cela leur arrivait, il ne faudrait pas qu'elles pensent qu'elles sont, une fois pour toutes, inassurables vis-à-vis de l'assurance offerte par l'entremise de l'A.C.P.U. Nous sommes venus à un accord avec la compagnie et notre courtier d'assurance, James P. Howell & Associates, en ce sens que si le nombre le justifie, nous n'épargnerons aucun effort pour que la combinaison d'assurance soit accessible à ceux qui ne seront pas assurés maintenant. Toutes les propositions d'assurance seront conservées dans un dossier et seront automatiquement examinées de nouveau par notre administrateur, Kanatia Consulting & Administration Incorporated, si la combinaison est rendue accessible. Bien entendu, tous les renseignements seront considérés comme étant strictement confidentiels.

Cordialement,

Charles C. Bigelow.

C.C. Bigelow
Président

66 Lisgar, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C1 • (613) 237-6885

Telex 013-3549

VOLS NOLISES ET VOYAGES DE GROUPE DE L'A.C.P.U.

VOYAGES DE GROUPE — 1973

MONTRÉAL/LONDRES/MONTRÉAL

29 avril (dim.) - 29 juin (ven.)	$204 *
6 mai (dim.) - 31 août (ven.)	$204
27 mai (dim.) - 3 sept. (lun.)	$204
10 juin (dim.) - 9 juil. (lun.)	$277
1er juil. (dim.) - 31 août (ven.)	$277
15 juil. (dim.) - 6 août (lun.)	$277
5 août (dim.) - 3 sept. (lun.)	$277

TORONTO/LONDRES/TORONTO

1er mai (mar.) - 24 août (ven.)	$222 **
20 mai (dim.) - 20 juil. (ven.)	$222
30 mai (mer.) - 31 août (ven.)	$222
8 juil. (dim.) - 23 juil. (lun.)	$296
26 août (dim.) - 7 sept. (ven.)	$296

* tarif des adultes, enfants de 2 à 11 ans : 50%, bébés : 10% — ** bébés : 10% du tarif de Mantréal

VOLS NOLISÉS — 1973

TORONTO/LONDRES/TORONTO

ALLER — EST

4 mai (ven.)	$104.00 par place
25 mai (ven.)	$104.00 " "
30 juin (sam.)	$122.50 " "
28 juil. (sam.)	$122.50 " "
25 août (sam.)	$112.50 " "

ALLER — OUEST

30 juil. (lun.)	$112.00 par place
17 août (ven.)	$112.00 " "
24 août (ven.)	$112.00 " "
1er sept. (sam.)	$112.00 " "

VOLS NOLISÉS — OUEST DU CANADA

WINNIPEG/LONDRES/WINNIPEG

25 mai (ven.) - 24 août (ven.)	$211.00 *
30 juin (sam.) - 1er sept. (sam.)	$252.00

Si un val nolisé n'est pas complet, les membres voyageront au tarif des groupes de 40 et paieront le supplément prévu.

EDMONTON/CALGARY à LONDRES

aller-retour

25 mai (ven.) - 24 août (ven.)	$234.00 *
30 juin (sam.) - 1er sept. (sam.)	$279.00

Les vayageurs de Calgary paient $20 de plus que ceux d'Edmanton

* tarif saisonnier pour chaque place

VOYAGES DE GROUPE — PROVINCES MARITIMES

HALIFAX/LONDRES/HALIFAX

27 mai (dim.) - 24 août (ven.)	$185, adultes, hors saisan (enfants, 50%, bébés, 10%)
15 juil. (dim.) - 6 août (lun.)	$259, adultes, pleine saison (enfants, 50%, bébés, 10%)

EUROPE

Montréal/Amsterdam	hors saisan :	$214	pleine saison :	$289	Tous ces tarifs s'appliquent aux graupes de 40 personnes
Francfart	" "	$225	" "	$299	
Paris	" "	$214	" "	$289	
Rome	" "	$294	" "	$358	

Hors saison : avril, mai, septembre, octobre — pleine saison : juin, juillet, août

La date des vols vers l'Est détermine le tarif aller-retour

Le programme de l'A.C.P.U. pour 1972 expose les conditians relatives aux vayages de graupe et par vols nalisés.

Pour de plus amples détails : Finlay Travel Ltd., B.P. 83, Centre Toronto Dominion, Toronto 111. Tél. : (416) 366-4936

Ces prix sont sujets à modifications

Autres vols vers Londres à Noël ($155.)

Vacancies Postes vacants

FOOD RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Director — Food Industry Reseorch Institute.** Applications are invited for the position of Director of the Food Industry Research Institute in the University of Guelph. The Director will hold an academic rank, will have an advanced degree preferably at the Ph.D. level in a field related to the food industry with demonstrated experience working in the food industry preferably as a member of the food industry. Experience or formal training in business administration an asset. The Director will publicize the available services of the Institute and develop the research, financial, administrative and contract procedures. He will negotiate and administer contracts and budgets, office operations and personnel and act as secretary to the Food Industry Research Institute Advisory Board. Salary is negotiable, commensurate with qualifications and experience. Contractually limited term appointment with renewal possibilities. Enquiries and applications, which should include the names of three referees, should be addressed to : Dr. W. E. Tossell, Dean of Research, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY. **Directar — Environmentol Sciences Centre (Kanonaskis). Duties :** Responsible for general supervision and direction of staff; budget; organizing teaching and research. The Director formulates policy in conjunction with an advisory committee and reports directly to the Vice-president (Academic). The Centre emphasizes interdisciplinary studies and provides facilities used by various University faculties and departments, and is a base for graduate students whose work demands access to the Rockies. Appointment could be effective November 1, 1972. **Qualificotions :** Ph.D. in a field closely related to Environmental Sciences and extensive research and management experience desirable. **Salary :** Commensurate with experience. **Applicatians :** By November 1, 1972 with **Curriculum Vitæ. To :** Dr. Stanley Norris, Academic Assistant to the Vice-President (Academic), The University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4.

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **School of Agricultural Economics and Extension Educatian.** Teaching and research position in Agricultural Finance. Applications are invited for the position of Assistant Professor in the School of Agricultural Economics and Extension Education. The position is for a production economist with specialization in the field of Agricultural Finance. The preferred candidate will have a Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics with specialization in production economics, and will have studied under one of the recognized authorities in the field of agricultural finance. The teaching responsibilities include undergraduate and graduate teaching to the Ph.D. level in production economics and farm management, agricultural finance, and quantitative methods. The successful candidate will be required to supervise the course programs and research theses of students in the Masters and Ph.D. degree programs in Agricultural Economics. Research responsibilities include the development and conduct of a research program and research projects in the areas of agrucultural credit, financial analysis and estate planning. Salary is negotiable and will be commensurate with experience. Closing date for the receipt of applications is 31 October, 1972. Candidates should send a **curriculum vitæ,** transcripts and supporting letters from three referees to : Professor T. K. Warley, Director, School of Agricultural Economics & Extension Education, Ontario Agricultural College, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

UNVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN. **Department af Agricultural Economics.** Applications are invited for a position as Assistant Professor ($11,400 - $14,796), Associate Professor ($15,000 - $19,200), or full Professor ($19,400 and up) with training in agricultural or agri-business marketing, and hopefully with a specialty in livestock marketing. Duties will consist of teaching, research and extension. Salary will depend on training and experience, and the appointment is effective as soon as possible. A Ph.D. or near Ph.D. is preferred. Apply with full **curriculum vitæ** to Dr. P. J. Thair, Head Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

MATHEMATICS

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA. **Department af Applied Mathematics.** Applications are invited for the position of Professor and Head of the newly formed Department of Applied Mathematics. The academic position would carry tenure on appointment, the administrative position as Head of the Department would be for an agreed period with the possibility of renewal. Applications, with full **curriculum vitæ,** should be addressed to the Dean of Science, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Department af Mathematics and Statistics.** Applications are invited for three positions in Statistics and Operations Research commencing September 1, 1973. These shall be at the Assistant or Associate Professor level. Applicants should have the doctorate, high teaching ability and be actively engaged in research. The duties involved will be undergraduate teaching and research. Applications with **curriculo vitæ,** giving the names of three persons to whom reference may be made should be sent to : Dr. A McD. Mercer, Acting Chairman, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA. **Position in Applied Mathematics.** A permanent position in the Department of Mathematics is open commencing in the fall of 1973. Candidates should be active in an applied area of current interest, with substantial research and teaching experience. Salary and rank are negotiable, to a maximum commensurate with the position of senior full professor. Interested candidates should apply, enclosing full particulars, before November 15, 1972, to : Professor S. G. Ghurye, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G1.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK. **Department af Business Administratian.** Applications are invited for undergraduate teaching in the following areas : a) Accounting b) Management c) Marketing d) Quantitative Methods. Qualifications required are Ph.D., Ph.D. candidate or equivalent; Rank and salary based on qualifications and experience. Appointment effective Jan. 1, 1973 or July 1, 1973. Apply to : Chairman, Department of Business Administration, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA. **Faculty of Business Administratian ond Commerce.** Teaching positions at Assistant, Associate and Full Professor ranks in areas of accounting, legal, environment, market-

ing, behavioral science, quantitative methods, and finance. Ph.D. degree required. Please forward letter of application accompanied by a resumé to Dean, Faculty of Business Administration and Commerce, University of Alberta, Edmonton. September 6, 1973.

BIOLOGY

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. **Department of Biology — Faculty of Science.** A Head is required for the Department of Biology. Applicants should have demonstrated an ability for teaching and for research, and have administrative experience. The appointment will be made at the level of Full Professor. Address applications, or a request for further information, to Dr. D. H. Rendell, Assistant Dean of Science and Chairman of the Search Committee. Applications should be received by 30 September 1972, or as soon as possible thereafter.

The Biology Department has 24 full-time faculty and offers undergraduate and graduate programmes to the Ph.D. level. The present research in the Department is on whole organisms with particular emphasis on boreal, terrestrial, and aquatic flora and fauna. Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland.

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. **Department of Biology.** Two vacancies exist at the Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada, in connection with a newly-established research unit investigating aspects of the biological control of mosquitoes and blackflies, for science technicians with formal qualifications in the fields of animal care or laboratory management. The posts now offered could also be filled at the research assistant level, in which case a completed B.Sc. in some aspects of biology would be a pre-requisite. It would be an advantage for candidates for one of the openings to have had laboratory experience in the care and maintenance of small mammals, birds, and freshwater fish. In the other case, interest and experience connected with fermentation cultivation of parasitic organisms and with the establishment and maintenance of mosquitoes and other biting fly colonies would be an asset. Applications with a full **curriculum vitæ** and the names of three referees should be submitted to the undersigned, from whom further details may be obtained. Marshall Laird, Research Professor (Parasitology).

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN — SASKATOON CAMPUS. **The Department of Biology** will appoint one, or two zoologists in the following fields : Developmental Biology, Comparative or Environmental Vertebrate Physiology, Molecular Biology. Positions may be filled at any academic rank. Effective July 1973. **Curriculum vitæ** should be sent before January to Dr. J. M. Naylor, Department Head.

CHEMISTRY

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. **Postdoctoral Fellowship — Department of Chemistry.** This post is available as of 1 September 1972, or as soon as possible thereafter. Applicants should have a background in physical adsorption with particular emphasis on capillary condensation phenomena. Yearly stipend — $7,400 (single, or married and childless); - $8,600 (married with children). Interested applicants should write to : Dr. W. D. Machin, Professor, Department of Chemistry, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's Newfoundland, Canada.

ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY. **Water Resources Engineering.** A new appointment at the Assistant, Associate or Professor level is available. Responsibilities include revision and development of undergraduate coursework in hydrology, hydraulics and water resources. The successful applicant will have professional experience in the field of water resources. A Ph.D. degree is desirable. Applicants should submit their resumé and the names of three referees to : Dr. M. A. Ward, Head, Department of Civil Engineering, The University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4.

McGILL UNIVERSITY. **Department of Civil Engineering and Applied Mechanics.** Applications are invited for a Departmental Chairman. The successful applicant should possess at Ph.D. degree and have demonstrated ability in research and development at responsible levels in the fields of either urban systems, transportation, environmental design or construction. In addition, he will be required to participate actively in teaching and research. Enquiries should be addressed to : The Dean, Faculty of Engineering, McGill University, P.O. Box 6070, Montréal 101, Québec.

COMMERCE

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. **Department of Commerce.** Applications are invited for the position of Head of Department of Commerce from individuals with appropriate academic qualifications. The appointment will be made at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor as soon as possible. Inquiries should be made to Professor G. A. Pynn, Chairman, Search Committee, Department of Commerce, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland.

CONSUMER STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Department of Consumer Studies.** The Department is open for applications from people interested in the study of all facets of the consumption process. Of particular interest would be someone qualified to teach and do research in the area of the economic and social aspects of housing and urban development. It would be expected that this person will have an appropriate graduate degree (preferably at the Doctoral level). The academic rank and salary are open and would be commensurate with the candidate's background. Anyone wishing more information or who would like to submit a resumé should do so through Dr. Richard E. Vosburgh, Professor and Chairman, Department of Consumer Studies, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Department of Consumer Studies.** The Department is interested in hiring someone at the Assistant Professor or Associate Professor level to teach and do research in the clothing area within an interdiciplinary department of Consumer Studies. It is preferred that the candidate have a Ph.D. or comparable research experience as he will be responsible for considering and developing a research program, as well as course material related to the consumption of clothing. The salary is open and would be commensurate with the applicant's experience. Enquiries and applications should be addressed to Dr. Richard E. Vasburgh, Chairman, Department of Consumer Studies, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Department of Consumer Studies.** The Department is interested in hiring someone at the Lecturer, or Assistant Professor level (or as qualifications warrant), to teach and do research in areas that relate product design to consumption behavior; contributing a designer's viewpoint in an interdisciplinary department of Consumer Studies. Prefer graduate work in the area of design, history of design, or behavioral sciences with an emphasis on some aspect of design and behavior. Will consider a Bachelor's degree plus experience in work involving designers directly or indirectly. The ability to function as a member of an interdisciplinary team is an important qualification. Salary negotiable. Enquiries and applications should be addressed to Dr. R. E. Vasburgh, Chairman, Department of Consumer Studies, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Deportment of Consumer Studies.** The Department is interested in hiring someone at the Lecturer or Assistant Professor level (or as qualifications warrant). It is preferred that the candidate have a Masters or Doctors degree involving the study of consumption (eg. marketing, home economics, economics) preferably with a good understanding of physical sciences appropriate to the analysis of consumer durable products. The ability to combine the behavioral and physical sciences within an interdisciplinary department is important. Teaching in areas of consumer behavior and the consumption of consumer durables. Replacing a faculty member on leave for two years. Salary is negotiable. Enquiries and applications should be addressed to Dr. Richard E. Vosburgh, Chaiman, Department of Consumer Studies, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

EDUCATION

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION. **Deportment of Curriculum.** A Chairman is required for the Department effective July 1, 1973. Affiliated with the University of Toronto, OISE conducts research, development, field services and programs of graduate studies leading to Ph.D., Ed.D., M.A. and M.Ed. degrees. One of 10 departments of OISE, members include 13 full-time faculty, 5 cross-appointments, 15 research & development staff, 15 general support staff and 665 full and part-time students. Enquiries should be addressed to Dr. A. F. Brown, Office of Academic Services, OISE, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.

FINE ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR. **Fine Arts Deportment.** Applications are invited for a teaching position at the rank of 1. Lecturer, M.A., with a specialization in High Renaissance, Baroque and Rococo Art along with a general knowledge of the survey of art material from the prehistoric through the modern period. Duties are to develop and teach these various areas along with building up library and slide library collections. Position available September 1, 1973. Salary $9,450 base (commensurate with experience and qualifications). Closing date for applications January 15, 1973. Please direct applications to Professor Michael J. Farrell, Assistant Prof., Fine Arts Department, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE. **Deportment of History.** An appointment will be made at the rank of Associate or Full Professor effective either January 1st or July 1st, 1973. The successful candidate should have a Ph.D., considerable teaching experience and substantial publications. This position will be primarily concerned with Canadian history, with emphasis on Western and French Canada. Consideration will also be given to the candidate's secondary field. Salary scale : Associate Professor $15,365 x 750 — $20,616, Full Professor $20,616 x 880 — open. Applications, accompanied by **curriculum vitæ** and three references, should be directed to G. E. Orchard, Acting Chairman, Department of History, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta T1K 3M4.

PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. **Deportment of Philosophy.** Assistant or Associate Professor. Ph.D. Publications preferred if Assistant, required if Associate. To teach and do research. Salary depending upon qualifications. Current floors are : Associate: $15,250, Assistant: $11,900. Applications should be sent to D. Odegard, Department Chairman, University of Guelph, Ontario.

SOCIAL WORK

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. **Deportment of Sociol Work.** Position : Assistant Professor; Qualifications : M.S.W.; Duties : Teaching and involvement in research and field practice. Applications should be addressed to the Acting Head, Department of Social Work, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada. Effective date of Appointment : 1 January 1973. Closing date for receipt of Applications : 31 October 1972.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY. **School of Sociol Work — Director.** Applications will be considered from social work educators and others with experience in closely related fields, including persons presently working in social work education, and social scientists experienced in the social work profession or social work education. Full-time faculty positions number twelve. The School offers the M.S.W. degree to approximately 100 students. Several faculty positions will also be available to be filled effective July 1, 1973. Therefore, it is hoped to appoint the new Director before the end of 1972. Enquiries or applications and **curriculum vitæ** should be submitted to P. C. Findlay, Secretary, Search Committee, School of Social Work, Carleton University, Ottawa, as soon as possible and not later than November 30, 1972. The successful candidate will be appointed initially for 5 years at the rank of full professor with tenure and salary commensurate with qualifications.

SOCIOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA. **Deportment of Sociology. Position :** Assistant or Associate Professor. **Quolificotions :** Ph.D. and record of scholarship. Specialty in criminology with emphasis upon corrections. Research in corrections and the justice system. **Solory :** Competitive. **Duties commence :** 1 January, 1973. **Applicotions to :** Dr. Charles W. Hobart, Acting Chairman, Department of Sociology, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. T6G 2H4. **Closing dote :** 15 October, 1972.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR. **Deportment of Sociology & Anthropology.** Applications are invited for the position of Head of the Department. Appointment to be effective July 1, 1973. Senior scholar with administrative experience preferred. Rank and salary depending on qualifications. Address inquiries to the Chairman, Selection Committee, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, no later than October 15, 1972.

VETERINARY MEDICINE

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH — ONTARIO VETERINARY COLLEGE. **Resident.** A junior position of Resident within the Veterinary Teaching Hospital is available in the Department of Clinical Studies. The Resident would take up duties in the area of Small Animal Medicine. His primary functions would be to oversee the interns and to participate in teaching small animal medicine at the undergraduate and graduate level. The position will be available from September 1, 1972 to terminate no later than August 31, 1974. An advanced degree of diploma in medicine and teaching experience would be valuable. The applicant must be licenced to practice Veterinary Medicine in the Province of Ontario. Enquiries regarding the position can be made to : Dr. J. Archibald, Chairman, Department of Clinical Studies, Ontario Veterinary College, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

AVAILABILITIES

Physicol Chemistry. European, male, 40, single, Dipl. Chem. Eng., Dr. Techn. Sci., Ph.D. 18 years' research experience, specialized in NMR spectroscopy; Publications. Seeks research and teaching position in NMR field. English and French. Available fall, 1973. Résumé and references on request. Box 68.

Biochemist-Neurochemist-Psychophormocologist. (Ph.D. 1965, Biochemistry, Uni-

versity of Illinois). University and Pharmaceutical Campany experience. Wants faculty or research position in an institute with facilities for brain research. Will consider administrative position offers. Available immediately. Box 69.

English. Citizen of Canada, Ph.D. (1964), 37 years of age, seeks an associate professorship. Specialization: Renaissance and Critical Theory. 14 years of teaching experience at undergraduate and graduate level in Canada, U.S., and India. Publications. Box 70.

Metallurgy. Ph.D., 38, university teaching, research and industrial R & D experience in physical and extra-active metallurgy. Research interests in mechanical and powder metallurgy, publications, seeks university appointment. Box 71.

Animal Physiology. Canadian, male, 28, single, Ph.D. (Australia). Basic research concerning appetite (one year) and times of retention of digesta in ruminants (four years). Some teaching experience. Travel across Canada, Australia, Asian countries — Indonesia to India, and Europe. Interested in research and teaching. Available in the summer of 1973. Box 72.

HISPANIC STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR. **Department of Hispanic Studies.** Possibility of one appointment, one year only. Rank: Assistant Professor with A.B.D. or Ph.D. Send applications to: Professor Ronold S. Pazik, Head, Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK. **Administrative Offices — Vacancy.** Dean of the Faculty of Nursing. Candidates should have a distinguished academic record, some university teaching experience, and preferably some administrative experience; as a minimum, a master's degree is required. The Faculty of Nursing currently consists of 15 faculty members and 170 undergraduate students. A graduate programme is a possibility for the near future. The effective date of appointment is 1 July 1973. Applications should be submitted, preferably before 31 December 1972, to Dr. L. G. Jaeger, Acting Vice-President (Academic), University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B. Applications will continue to be accepted until the post is filled.

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

ALLAN MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHIATRY. **Director — Department of Clinical Psychology.** Joint appointment with the Department of Psychology, McGill University. We are inviting applications for a joint appointment as Director of Clinical Psychology at the Allan Memorial Institute, and for an academic appointment in the Department of Psychology and Department of Psychiatry at McGill University. The job functians are highly diversified, involving organization and responsibility for clinical services, hospital administration duties, clinical teaching and training of psychalogists and other mental health trainees. The department head would be expected to be involved in research and to promote this interest in his staff. Additionally, the department would benefit from the Chief Psychologist's leadership in assuming responsibility for a treatment service. The university appointments require that the Director teach on a part-time basis, psychology students and psychiatric residents. This aspect of the Director's duties is highly desirable in terms of the stimulating and valuable contribution in teaching and advising students and the cantact at the university with one's peers. We are interested in someone who has demanstrated abilities in clinical, administrative and academic areas. For additional information, please contact: Dr. Jahn Corson, Chairman, Selection Committee, Allan Memorial Institute af Psychiatry, 1025 Pine Avenue West, Montréal, Québec.

Get Set For CANADIAN EDUCATION SHOWPLACE

COLISEUM·EXHIBITION PARK
TORONTO
OCTOBER 26,27,28,1972

CES 72

Canadian Education Showplace comes to Toronto's Exhibition Park, October 26, 27, 28! Now is the time to make your plans to attend North America's largest, liveliest education show!

· SEE eight great shows in one. Displays by more than 300 exhibitors are conveniently grouped in clearly defined areas. Audio-visual hardware. Software. Furniture, gymnasium equipment, maintenance equipment. Shop equipment. Scientific instruments. Books and supplies. Plus a big British section and Government exhibits.

· VISIT RESOURCE CENTRE '72 — the most comprehensive presentation and demonstration of instructional media, materials and techniques ever staged in Canada. This big CES '72 feature is produced by the Instructional Materials Centre of Humber College of Applied Arts & Technology and will be staffed by highly qualified educators, instructors and technical personnel.

· TAKE PART in a stimulating program of seminars, conferences, films, demonstrations, special events — all geared to the specific needs and interests of educators, administrators and industrial training and development personnel.

· SEE award-winning school designs on display in the National Exhibition of School Architecture.

· NOW IS THE TIME to order your free invitation-registration cards. And be sure to ask about the CES Travel Package with special rates on air fares and hotel accommodation. Just fill in and return the coupon below, or write Canadian Education Showplace, 481 University Ave., Toronto 2, Ont. Telephone (416) 362-5311.

CANADIAN EDUCATION SHOWPLACE
481 University Ave., Toronto 2, Ontario

PLEASE SEND ME

..... (quantity) Free CES '72 invitation-registration cards

..... Information on CES Travel Package

Name .....

School/Company .....

Address .....

City ..... Prov. .....

Report of the Executive Secretary

By ALWYN BERLAND

Professor Alwyn Berland has been Executive Secretary of C.A.U.T. since 1968. Previously he was Chairman of the English Department and Dean of Arts and Science at the University of Saskatchewan in Regina.

During this last year, membership in C.A.U.T. has grown to some 16,500 faculty, an increase of about 7½% over the preceding year. Member associations now number 48, with the addition this last year of O.I.S.E. It is not yet possible to determine what is the "official" count for faculty in Canada, but to the best of our present knowledge, C.A.U.T. enrolls between 70 and 75% of all eligible faculty members. That compares very favourably with the present membership of our fraternal association, the American Association of University Professors, whose present membership stands at about 30%. About one-fourth of our membership, through 13 associations, are remitting fees on a monthly basis.

An additional number of faculty associations have adopted opt-out membership this last year, and that accounts for a fair proportion of our increased membership. I will not elaborate here on the virtues of the opt-out system or on the obvious advantages of increased strength, financial resources, and solidarity.

We have grown in one other sense this year, through the basic structural revision of C.A.U.T. with the adoption of new By-Laws at the November Council meeting, which brings into formal membership four provincial faculty associations. That revision of structure took much time and effort on the part of many individuals in committees, the Executive, the provincial associations, the Central Office, and Council itself. It is still too early to forecast just how these structural changes will affect our work, but I am convinced that with good will and cooperation as we move into new relationships our activities will be made more effective and better coordinated, and that faculty associations at all levels of organization will benefit.

Looking back at the work of our Association over the last two years what impresses me most is the amount of guidance we have offered Canadian faculty in the form of guidelines, policy statements, and manuals. These cover a wide range of activities and speak to a large number — though by no means all — of the concerns that confront academics in the 1970s. In the last two years, C.A.U.T. has adopted these statements or guidelines:

— Guidelines concerning Professional Ethics

— Guidelines concerning Grievance Procedures: Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members and Faculty Associations

— Guidelines concerning C.A.U.T. Procedures relating to Censure

— Policy Statement on the Advertising of Academic Posts in Canadian Universities

— Guidelines concerning Reductions in Academic Appointments for budgetary reasons

— Guidelines concerning Salary Negotiations

Last year we improved our Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure in the area of probationary appointments; and this year we have tightened and improved the section on dismissal procedures.

Equally important is the publication this year of the C.A.U.T. Handbook, the realization of a wish that began very shortly after I came to C.A.U.T. The Handbook for the first time in our history draws together all

of our policy statements, guidelines, and general obiter dicta; it has been very well received, not least by university administrators, many of whom already give us rich indications that they have been reading the Handbook with some care.

In addition we have submitted briefs on behalf of C.A.U.T. to the federal government on copyright, on the new income tax law, on Canadian publishing, and on RCMP activities on university campuses; to the Wright Commission of Ontario on its report on Post-Secondary Education; to the government of Quebec on the dangers of excessive foreign ownership of bookstores and distribution agencies; and to the government of Ontario on Canadian book publishing. We have prepared for the academic community, and whoever else we can get to read it, a very useful "Primer on Tenure".

Our services have included a substantial increase in charter flights available to our members, in the proposal before this meeting for a C.A.U.T.-sponsored life insurance plan, and the publication of an Income Tax Guide in collaboration with several of the provincial faculty associations: O.C.U.F.A., F.A.P.U.Q., and C.A.F.A. If that sounds like a clockwork orange, I am simply pointing, with thanks, to Ontario, Quebec, and Alberta.

At the present time we are moving toward guidelines or policy statements on student evaluation of faculty, on collective bargaining, and on patents. We are examining our guidelines on professional ethics with a view to seeing what further direction might be useful or necessary in the area of secondary employment. We are working on a model contract for faculty appointments. We have met with a number of other professional associations to consider ways of improving data on Canadian manpower, especially on supply and demand of highly qualified manpower.

That is all respectable ground for some sense of gratification on the part of C.A.U.T. But of course the work is never finished, and there are current challenges that demand our time and thought with an urgency that we have not felt for some years.

Having only recently grown accustomed to Galbraith's formulations on the Affluent Society, we as academics find ourselves confronting a period of acute economic adversity, of a kind that has caught many of us, and our institutions, off guard. The immediate and direct challenges include faculty cutbacks, graduate school freezes, great pressures to increase class sizes, faculty workloads and assembly-line techniques. Less direct, perhaps, but equally urgent, are the effects on university governance : the loss of university autonomy to governments and governmental agencies, the transfer of authority within universities rather less to faculty than is frequently supposed by those who keep talking about the "post-duff-berdahlized" university and more to a new managerial class of administrators: administrative vice-presidents, vice-presidents planning, vice-presidents development, vice-presidents personnel, deans, vice-deans and associates, administrative and executive assistants — managers, moguls, and mandarins. This development of a new mandarinate, rarely elected, and rarely responsible directly to faculty councils or senates, is one of the strongest impulses, I believe, together with the growing government control of universities, that is contributing to the remarkable growth of interest among faculty members in collective bargaining. Faculty at many Canadian universities have begun to fear that their increased representation on boards and councils and four-star committees has not brought them any closer to present sources of power and of the crucial decision-making that is shaping, or re-shaping, the universities. We have striven for many years to make real the theory of shared authority, only to find that the citizens of the academic republic with whom we share so many meetings have less and less authority to share. Whether formalized collective bargaining is *the* remedy for faculty who see their relative economic positions worsening and their authority in ordering the academic life of the university weakening is an issue that must receive our careful study at a high level of priority. We have begun that study as a Council at this meeting, but we have scarcely begun to grapple with this crucial subject.

A second indirect effect of the new adversity is a growing consciousness and militancy about hiring practices and policies in Canadian universities. One aspect of this problem concerns the advertising of academic and administrative positions, a policy which C.A.U.T. first urged almost 20 years ago, and which the grandfather of the present A.U.C.C. proposed as early as 1911 — in neither case with much result. In 1970 the C.A.U.T. Council adopted a more militant resolution for mandatory advertising, and the Executive in February 1971 urged that the senior academic body of each Canadian university legislate compulsory advertising. That militancy has resulted in a very great leap in bringing practice closer to precept, although there are still too many universities that have yet to commit themselves to such a policy.

In revising our own publications policy, we have paid careful attention to the coordination of publication dates of our new periodical with the significant deadlines for the advertising of university positions.

Beyond advertising, however, there are other measures being advocated by various groups which are more vigorous expressions of a new nationalism or protectionism that may have taken root in a particular conception of Canadianism, but which are blossoming now under the forced feeding of job scarcity. C.A.U.T. must, I think, work out some more explicit policies that will honour the quite legitimate claims that Canadian scholars have for employment in Canadian universities, that will not jeopardize the emphasis on academic

qualifications as the primary criterion for university work, and without developing a new parochialism or isolationism. The Guideline on Canadianization adopted by the Executive Committee in June 1969 still reads very persuasively :

> The . . . criterion to be used in engaging a professor must continue to be his *competence* in the broad sense of his capacity to carry out the functions for which he was engaged. Competence thus includes not only his promise and ability as teacher and scholar, but also those qualities which affect his performance within the Canadian academic community. In areas where a familiarity with things Canadian is important, as for example in Canadian history or government or literature, then competence requires that knowledge. Such knowledge is not confined to Canadian citizens, although it may require residence and study in Canada. From this viewpoint, the chairman of a department (of history for instance, or French, English, etc.) who is unsympathetic or indifferent to the development of Canadian studies is clearly incompetent regardless of his academic qualifications, his citizenship, or national origin.

Recognizing the necessary relationships of the Canadian university to the international community of scholarship and learning, as well as to its own society and culture, C.A.U.T. may well wish to affirm that the intellectual life of the university community is best served through the deliberate cultivation of pluralism in represented schools of thought, critical approaches, methodologies, and perspectives. Canadian universities have a responsibility to sustain that pluralism, within which a proper attention to Canadian content both in course offerings and in research commitments will be assured.

In serving those ends, I believe that academic qualifications and competence in required areas should be paramount in the consideration of new appointments and the renewal of probationary or other nontenured appointments. Considerations of race, sex, religion, citizenship or natural origin regarded as relevant to particular positions ought to be supported by formal agreement of faculty on appropriate governing policies, and these governing policies ought to be consistent with legislation on human rights and equal opportunity.

The final effect of the new adversity that I want to comment on is related to the work of C.A.U.T. in the area of terms and conditions of appointment and the protection of academic freedom. The Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure is reporting to you on activities that continue to be a major commitment of our time and resources. I wish here to speak of one problem only, on which I think C.A.U.T. and its member associations must develop a firmer policy.

We have a list of censured administrations that many of us think to be very worrisome. We are not accustomed, and perhaps not reconciled, to seeing 4 or 5 administrations lie under our official disapproval. In the United States, the worry is similar; at the annual meeting of the A.A.U.P. which I attended earlier this month, there was much concern expressed over the fact that its censure list has increased to 28, the longest in its history.

The A.F.&T. Committee and the Central Office have worked harder this last year than ever before to anticipate serious problems by early intervention through letters, telephone calls and local visits in attempts to head off the escalation of major cases. A number of serious cases have been resolved through vigorous action on the part of good local faculty associations as well. We think we have been relatively successful, though the strains on our resources resulting from this kind of activity are very considerable. Whether we continue to be as effective remains to be seen. It is quite possible that we shall have to invent other modes of dealing with very serious cases than censure, but we none of us have convinced ourselves as to what these alternatives might be. While that search continues, I think we must address ourselves to another issue, having to do with the prevention of censure rather than its implementation.

What steps lead to the possibility of censure ? First, improper actions or procedures involving terms and conditions of faculty appointment have proven resistant to remedy or correction through discussion, negotiation, mediation — through what Jim Milner used to call the appeal to sweet reason.

C.A.U.T. then invokes the instruments of public or political pressure, through publicity perhaps in the form of press releases or the circulation of an investigatory report. If such publicity fails in effect, C.A.U.T. considers another instrument, the threat of censure. There may be two alternative explanations given for our arrival at this stage :

a) the university may argue that it was, in effect, correct in its actions by standards acceptable to the general academic community and therefore that it has no intention or wish to alter what it believes was a proper decision;

or

b) the university may argue that it was correct in its actions by standards established by itself and considered to be as good or better than those of general currency in the academic community; or, even if not as good, as having sufficient legal force to justify the rejection of other standards.

Of those alternative accounts, the first — that the university was correct in its actions by standards acceptable to the academic community — has been rejected by the A.F.&T. Committee through its recommendation to the Executive for C.A.U.T. action, and by the Executive Committee by its acceptance of that recommendation. The actual vote for censure means, of course, that the Council has rejected it as well.

The second alternative — that the university remains convinced that its procedures were sufficient, either in quality or in technical legality, however they may depart from standards acceptable to the general academic community as these are expressed for instance in the Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure — this is the situation that must continue to concern C.A.U.T., and especially the A.F.&T. Committee.

That may all sound rather obvious, but it is a necessary prelude to seeing a major problem. That is the status or jurisdiction of the C.A.U.T. Policy Statement in application to grievances at individual universities. Where all goes well, the faculty, the faculty association and C.A.U.T. agree on this jurisdiction and the administration can most often be brought to agreement at least through the introduction of ad hoc remedies and ultimately through the adoption of local regulations consistent with our policy statement. Such a happy resolution to what otherwise would have become major cases was achieved this last year at Waterloo Lutheran, for instance, and at St. Mary's.

But all may *not* go well, in one of these ways :

(i) the administration may continue to refuse to recognize the validity or jurisdiction of our policy statement, although the faculty association supports it;

(ii) a significant part of the faculty association, as well as the administration, may not wish to support the application of C.A.U.T. standards to an individual grievance, for one of two reasons :

a) the local association may not in fact wish to uphold C.A.U.T. policy in the presence of weaker or contradictory local regulations or of local regulations that are silent on the procedures that we have adjudged to be unsatisfactory;

b) the local association may feel that while in principle the C.A.U.T. policies are meritorious, the individual grievance is not somehow meritorious enough to justify an insistence on their application.

Now the fact that the overwhelming majority of cases coming before A.F.&T. are resolved without publicity, let alone censure, suggests that the unhappy contradictions I have just identified are not numerous. This year the Committee dealt with 103 cases. But such contradictions do occur, sometimes with grievous effects for the individual professor whose appeal becomes contentious not only as between himself and an administration, but between his own faculty association and the C.A.U.T. to whom he has appealed.

The terms of reference of the A.F.&T. Committee are, generally, to deal with grievances or appeals resulting from unsatisfactory conditions for academic freedom and tenure as judged by the principles adopted by the C.A.U.T. The A.F.&T. Committee is mandated to uphold the policy statements of the Association; in doing so it does not act in disregard to local variants or alternatives, so long as these do not constitute substantively lower levels of fairness or equity than our policy statements.

I believe that local associations must therefore commit themselves to one of the two alternatives : Either, first, to assure that local regulations are made consistent with the C.A.U.T. policy statements or if they are not, to commit themselves to supporting C.A.U.T. policies in individual grievances where these policies have been ignored or violated; or, second, to revise the mandate under which the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure presently operates, so as to restrain it from interfering in any case in which local regulations have not been explicitly contravened even if these are inconsistent with C.A.U.T. policies and principles.

It would be folly to pretend that both of these alternatives are equally attractive, or even feasible. The second would, in my view, be disastrous to the state of academic freedom in Canada. Nevertheless, there needs to be a more conscious deliberation of these alternatives by member associations, and a clear affirmation of one or the other. The work of the A.F.&T. Committee is too strenuous, and too important, to be weakened by serious ambiguities of jurisdiction. It is difficult enough for C.A.U.T. to be told by administrators that they feel bound only by local regulations, no matter how old, or how arrived at, or by whom. This difficulty must not be increased by our being told, from time to time, that the local faculty association agrees with that view.

I suspect that I have been preaching to the (largely) converted. If I have, then I still appeal to the converted to assist in bringing the unregenerated to the sinners bench, or at least to enlightenment. Less pretentiously, I mean that Council should give consideration to the need to affirm categorically the primacy of the C.A.U.T. policy statements where in our view local regulations do not adequately protect the academic freedom of faculty, or provide a sufficient guarantee of equity and fair dealing.

I conclude, then, with some notes on the Central Office. We have had for the best part of this last aca-

demic year, the extremely helpful services of Professor Joe Scanlon as Assistant Executive Secretary. Joe has been on leave from Carleton, and resting up by working 70 hours a week for C.A.U.T. Besides being wonderfully ingenious in getting us plugged into many new charter flights, and a new group life insurance plan and membership discounts for rental cars and such, he has helped immeasurably to restore to coherence a financial accounting system rendered almost hopeless by some four years of jiggery and pokery — a phrase I prefer to the equally obscene but more formal term, *defalcation.* In any case, I feel that Joe was a Godsend, and we are all in his debt. (Morally — that is — not financially.)

We have just appointed, as the new Assistant Executive Secretary, Mr. Pierre Leahey, who will join us in June from an experience that has taken him from the University of Sherbrooke to the Conference of Rectors and Principals of Quebec to the federal government to us.

We have lost our information officer, Linda Mitchell, who has resigned owing mainly to bad health and family commitments, and leaves with our appreciation and gratitude, especially for the launching of the very successful *NEWSLETTER,* and we are losing our Research Officer, Bertrand Dionne, who finds the lures of Montreal irresistible. And finally, but by no means the least of our losses, we are losing Elizabeth Peters, whose husband has been posted out of Ottawa by the Canadian armed Forces — a fact alone which convinces me of the wisdom of pacifism. Elizabeth has been my secretary, recently our office manager, and secretary to Council and to the Executive, and one of the most loyal and passionate supporters of the aims and objectives of the Association that I know.

Don Savage, who functions as secretery to the A.F.&T. Committee and who also does three hundred other things, all of them tirelessly and well, stays on, as does C.A.U.T.'s staff member of longest standing, Velma Reid. For these favours, our deepest thanks.

I address a regular Council meeting for the last time as Executive Secretary: you must therefore indulge me long enough to let me say that working for C.A.U.T. has meant that I have met more dedicated academics and more splendid people that I knew existed in the university community, and that in the dark days that occasionally befall the central office of such an organization, it was that fact that kept me going. Since I shall be with C.A.U.T. until the end of December, that may all sound premature; I assure you that I intend to keep on going, and if anyone expects me to behave like a lame duck they'll have to shoot me first.

COMMUNICATION DE L'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ

BOURSE 1973-74

J. H. STEWART REID

Valeur : $2,500. *Endroit :* une université canadienne qui offre les études au niveau du 2° cycle ou du 3° cycle. *Domaine d'études :* tous les domaines. *Durée :* un an; le candidat peut toutefois poser sa candidature au concours de l'année suivante. *Qualifications :* (a) citoyenneté canadienne ou résidence au Canada à titre d'immigrant reçu en date du 1er février 1972 ou plus tôt; (b) inscription à un programme d'études supérieures dans une université canadienne ou admissibilité aux études supérieures en 1973-74. *Date limite:* 1er février 1973. Pour de plus amples renseignements ou pour obtenir les formulaires de candidature, veuillez écrire à la: Préposée, service des bourses, Association canadienne des professeurs d'université, 66, rue Lisgar, Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 0C1.

Post-Secondary Fetishism

Financing Post Secondary Education in Canada: A Report Commissioned by the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada. By Stephen G. Peitchinis. Calgary, July 1971. P. 451 + xiii.

It is fortunate that this is a report to, not by, the Council of Ministers of Education. It will not be much help to them. For while the implications, financial and otherwise, of the past and present systems of financing post-secondary education in Canada are examined at length, the implications of the drastic changes proposed are not. The financial implications are scarcely discussed at all, and the implications for the quality of higher education are insufficiently examined.

The Council of Ministers wanted a study of the magnitude and implications of federal participation in financing post-secondary education. This was broadened into a study, or rather a series of studies, historical, statistical and analytical, of various aspects, provincial and federal, of the financing of post-secondary education. This is all the good. As a compendium of statistical information and analysis, the report has some value. Six specialists, from four provinces, were enlisted to do these studies. They are named in the preface, and the names, at least those known to me, command respect. What is not clear is how closely the chapters of the report corresponding to these several studies follow the texts of the studies, and how far the material was reworked by Dr. Peitchinis. The recommendations are presumably Dr. Peitchinis's own.

The general position of the report, not suprisingly, is pro-provincial and anti-federal. There is nothing wrong with this. It is an arguable position. But it is not well argued. There is passing hostile reference to the A.U.C.C.'s consistently pro-federal stand, but the case for a federal presence is not examined. The federal government is castigated for having, in the past, made unilateral decisions about the manner of its support of post-secondary education, and the report's first recommendation is that the federal government should not be allowed to do so in the future: it should be required to submit any proposals to a new permanent "Federal-Provincial Committee on Post-Secondary Education", and not do anything without agreement there with any provincial governments that would be affected. A general provincial veto power is recommended to replace insufficient consultation. This is typical of the report's logical leaps.

The substantive recommendations are even more striking. The most destructive one, which is about the financing of research, we shall consider last. The other main recommendation, even more striking and possibly as destructive, is about the financing of post-secondary costs other than research: governments (provincial and federal) should stop subsidizing colleges and universities, and instead subsidize the students, after shifting virtually the whole non-research operating costs to the students in the form of higher fees.

It is curious how this position is reached. The premiss is that the share of total governmental expenditures that goes to post-secondary education must be greatly decreased. The opening chapter argues that the rate of increase of public expenditure on post-secondary education during the last two decades not only will, but should, be sharply decreased: that for the next decade it will have to go "down to the rate of increase in total resources, or even below that rate" (p. 9), in order to give a better showing to other services, such as "health care, social assistance, urban transportation, roads, pollution, public housing, law and order, and aid to less developed countries" (p. 6), whose share in the increasing resources over those decades was less than the share of the post-secondary education. No notice is taken of the elementary point that expenditures on post-secondary education are more likely than many of the other expenditures to pay off in increased productivity and therefore in an increased amount of national income available for other services. That point was clearly made in the Bladen Report, but since the Bladen Commission was set up by university people it is dismissed by Dr. Peitchinis with a slighting reference (sensibly enough, since the comparison would be odious to his report). Not content with assuming that the rate of increase of public expenditure on post-secondary education must go down, in spite of the projected increase in the number of students for whom that education will have to be supplied, Dr. Peitchinis positively welcomes the decrease as a way of weeding out the ineffficient (he seems to mean administrators rather than professors) who climbed in during the period of rapid expansion (p. 10). He winds up by pronouncing himself in favour of the imposition of a ceiling on public expenditures on post-secondary education. Provided this did not involve restrictions on entry, he sees no problem. It might mean larger classes, reduction in the number of course offerings, and increased teaching loads, but none of these would necessarily reduce the quality of what he understands as education.

Having assumed the necessity of a sharp decline in the rate of governmental support of post-secondary education, Dr. Peitchinis turns to consider the possibility of other sources of support. He finds only one: higher fees for students. So he recommends this. Student fees at present are estimated to cover only about 15% of the operating costs of universities. Dr. Peit-

chinis would raise that to 57%. He is aware of course that any such increase in fees would have to be accompanied by a scheme of student assistance by grants and/or loans. He offers such a scheme. Let us look first at the basis of his recommendation for raising the fee component from 15% to 57%, and then at his student assistance scheme.

The whole cost of higher education, he says, should be divided between the students and the whole society in proportion to the benefit reaped by each. An unexceptionable proposition. But how to determine the proportion of benefits? The difficulties of a cost-benefit analysis of higher education are indeed great. What proportion of benefit accrues to the educated individuals, and what proportion to society as a whole, is not easy to say. The amount of benefit to the individuals can be calculated in various ways, but the amount of benefit to society cannot be calculated in dollars and cents, therefore the proportion cannot be calculated. But since Dr. Peitchinis was anxious to say something about the best proportion of fees to government subsidies he plunges in, and produces a simplistic (and fallacious) answer.

He divides the operating costs as between "instruction", "research", and "service", in proportion to the faculty time said to be devoted to each of these. Anyone who has tried to fill out the kind of questionnaire on which these time estimates are based will know how shaky they are. They require an assumption, impossible for any genuine professor to accept, that his function can be divided into instruction and research, as if his thinking ("research") were separable from his teaching ("instruction"). That Dr. Peitchinis is unaware of this is suggested by his curious argument (p.403), offered in rebuttal of the view expressed to him by various academics that teaching loads should not be increased because that would impede professors' ability to pursue new knowledge. His reply is that "considering that new knowledge is highly specialized, it is beyond the reach of the majority of students," and therefore professors should not spend so much of their time on pursuits so useless to their students. What a cry from the depths! What kind of students has Dr. Peitchinis ever had? This is what comes of treating universities as merely post-secondary instructional academies — dame's schools, in Northrop Frye's sardonic phrase.

But let us, in view of the exigencies of public finance, accept the division into teaching and research. Dr. Peitchinis calculates, on no very specific evidence, that university professors divide their time in the proportion of 50% "instruction", and 35% "research", and 15% "service". It is then assumed that "research" on the whole benefits society, not students, so society should pay for all of it (p. 391). It is then assumed that students are the major beneficiaries of "instruction" (although "society as a whole derives some benefits from the instructional activity"), therefore *(sic)* "students should bear the entire cost burden related to this activity" (p. 392). It is then calculated, by a series of assumptions attributed to "a consultant to this project", that the benefit of the 15% cost "service" is about equally shared by the students and the society. It is thus concluded that the benefits are shared, and the costs should therefore be shared, by the society bearing 35% ("research") plus 8% (half of "service"), a total of 43%; and the students bearing the other 57%. Since the present share of student fees in the operating costs of universities is only about 15%, this would require approximately a quadrupling of student fees. If this bore any relation to the proportion of benefit, one could accept this as just. But there is no evidence that it does. It is based on at least two fallacies: that "instruction" can be quantitatively separated from "research"; and that although society as a whole derives some benefit from "instruction", and although cost should be allocated in proportion to benefit, the students should bear the *whole* cost of instruction. What is one to say about conclusions based on such reasoning?

Compared with this, the inadequacy of the scheme for financial assistance to the students is inconsiderable. But it should be noticed. An "Integral Student Assistance System" is proposed. It is designed to ensure that every potential post-secondary student will have enough money to cover his subsistence, transportation, supplies and incidentals, and fees, no matter how low his family's income (or *his* income, if his family refuses to support him). When the income is very low, the whole of this amount is to be an unconditional government grant to the student. Moving up the income scale, the proportion that is grant declines and the proportion that is available as loan increases. The illustrative figures (p. 364) are: income $5000 or less, 100% grant; $6000, 95% grant 5% loan; and so for every additional $1000 income, 5% less grant and 5% more loan; reaching, at $25,000 income, zero grant and 100% loan. It is assumed, in the illustrative scheme, that the whole amount required by a student for a year, for fees, subsistence, etc., is $2000: this therefore would be the maximum grant and/or loan.

Now, what happens to this scheme, the cost of which to governments is never estimated, if fees go up, as they would under the proposals for shifting the burden of operating costs from society to the student? Fees which now are about $500 would become $2000. The whole amount needed for subsistence and fees would become $3500. Clearly the scale of grants and their relation to income could not remain anything like the illustrative figures. For instance, by those figures, a student from a family with $10,000 income would get 75% grant ($1500) and 25% loan ($500). With the new fees he would need not $2000 but $3500. If this were split in the same ratio it would require $2525 grant and $875 loan. But if a $500 per annum indebtedness was thought to be the most that would not de-

ter a student from a $10,000 family from going on to post-secondary studies, then an $875 per annum indebtedness would deter him. So, if the objective of universal financial accessibility is to be maintained, the whole of the extra $1500 fees would have to be added to the unconditional grant. The cost is thus not shifted from the government to the students, except for students from high-income families, who would not be entitled to any grant. It may well be more just to take them off the taxpayer's back. But if the assistance scheme is to be really effective in enabling potential students from low-income families who do not now go on to post-secondary education, to do so, the additional government outlay, under the quadrupled fees proposal, would be very much greater than under the present fee structure.

It would have been helpful if the report had worked out some of these implications. Indeed it is a grave oversight not to have done so, because the underlying assumption of the whole report, as mentioned above, is that the rate of increase of public expenditure on post-secondary education will (and should) decline sharply in the 1970s. And it is *for that reason* that the report proposes the increase in fees as the only alternative source of funds. But if governments have to disburse anything like the same amount as before, this is not an *alternative* to government spending. The whole logic of the fee-grant-loan proposals is undermined without some estimates of the cost. It is unacceptable to be told that "the nature of the proposed methods precludes the possibility of computing an estimate of the costs" (p. 400). No doubt each province would have to decide what the basic grant/loan amount would be, but the total cost to the province could surely be computed without difficulty on any of several assumptions about that, and the total cost under a scheme of quadrupled fees be compared with the total cost at present fee levels.

The arguments and recommendations we have noticed so far have little to do with the question of *federal* financing of post-secondary education. And although that was the *raison d'être* of the commission, the report has very little to say about it, except historically. The sparsity of recommendations about this is at first sight astonishing: only one (No. 26) of the 31 recommendations deals with it. But astonishment at this recedes (in face of a greater astonishment) when one sees the reason why no more is said. The reason, which is not fully borne in on the reader until the very last page of the report, is that Dr. Peitchinis believes that no government, federal or provincial, should continue to give general financial support to post-secondary education.

Except for certain programmes that governments may wish to support for their social value, the whole cost of post-secondary education (apart from research) should be shifted to the students in the first instance, and then a large but unestimated part of it be picked up by governments as subsidies to students. This is made explicit in recommendation 31 : "The general subsidization of post-secondary education should be terminated forthwith. To the extent that it is socially desirable to subsidize certain programmes or some students the subsidies should be made specific and should be related to the attainment of the social goals" (p. 451). Given this sweeping proposal, most of what needed to be said about federal financing could be said in the one recommendation 26, which merely calls for federal financing of (a) certain unspecified "programmes", wholly, or jointly (to an unspecified extent) with a province, and (b) certain grants to students, chiefly, 50% of the unconditional grants under the student assistance scheme, (as well as (c) the whole cost of "all research which is not an integral part of the instructional process", which, as we shall see, is treated as something separable from education).

The heart of the recommendation about federal financing, then, is that the whole cost of post-secondary education (as distinct from research) should be shifted to the students, and half the grants to the students be borne by the federal government. There is much to be said for governments getting out of general subsidizing of universities, and subsidizing students instead. But considering the money that provincial governments have poured into establishing new universities in the last decade or two, some of which would not fare well under a régime of consumer sovereignty, the proposal is not likely to be well received by provincial governments. Nor, in the absence of any cost estimates of the two methods of financing post-secondary education, is the federal government given much encouragement to welcome the proposed change.

We have finally to notice what the report says about the financing of university *research*. Starkly, it recommends that the three main federal granting bodies — the National Research Council, the Medical Research Council, and the Canada Council, should be "divested of their fund dispensing role and transformed into advisory and evaluative committees" (p. 311). Advisory to what? To a new over-all co-ordinating body *to be appointed jointly by the federal and provincial governments* (p. 310). This body, the "Commission for Social, Cultural and Scientific Development", would allocate *all* federal funds for research, to individuals, research institutes, and universities, throughout Canada (p. 292). It would create *a list* of research priorities (p. 431), and would refuse funds to any researches not falling within the list (p. 433). And this Moloch is to be constituted "along the lines of existing Universities Commissions" (p. 293).

It passes belief that anyone with any knowledge of existing provincial university commissions could make such a recommendation. It is true that the report is dated July 1971, but it should have been apparent even

before the 1972 disclosures about the Ontario Committee on University Affairs that these university commissions are not always independent mediators between governments and universities, but rather, when governments so wish, screens behind which government policy is imposed on universities. Perhaps this does not worry Dr. Peitchinis. But their competence should worry him. For even when they are allowed independent scope they are hard pressed to perform adequately the relatively simple (because intra-provincial) allocative functions expected of them. How could it be otherwise with bodies so constituted ? Now imagine a *federal-provincial* commission, to supersede N.R.C., M.R.C., and the Canada Council, made up of 20 to 30 members, appointed by the federal and the 10 provincial governments, each government thinking, of course, of "the public interest" and so appointing mainly laymen. Could anything be more ludicrous than to give such a body power to determine all research priorities, and to allocate all federal funds for research ?

What has pushed Dr. Peitchinis to this fantastic recommendation ? Nothing that one can see, beyond his ill-considered idea that *co-ordination* is the thing. At all costs, he believes, there must be a single co-ordinating body, for all Canadian academic research. Research funding must not all be allowed to remain "chaotic", with each of the federal councils, as now, having its own granting criteria. But why not ? N.R.C., M.R.C., and the Canada Council may have faults, but their faults could be multiplied in this proposal. At least they know what they are doing, and have worked out effective appraisal techniques. Either they would, in their new roles as "advisory and evaluative committees", continue to make the effective decisions (in which case, why have a co-ordinating body over them ?) or they would not (in which case the authority of their appraisal techniques is diminished).

The only grounds offered for this recommendation are trivial. The present system, it is said, invites "distortion" of programmes and activities (p. 290), by encouraging grantsmanship. But is it not likely that grantsmanship would be raised to a higher power, and take more of everybody's time, by having to address itself to yet one more level of granting authority ? The other ground offered is that the present division of grants decisions between the three federal Councils is bad for interdisciplinary research prospects. I have no direct knowledge of N.R.C. and M.R.C. attitudes on interdisciplinary grants, but I have some reason to suppose that the Canada Council is quite solicitous of interdisciplinary projects. And it is not apparent that the proposed federal-provincial laymen's "Commission for Social, Cultural and Scientific Development" would be any more interdisciplinary-minded, except in response to very sophisticated grantsmanship. The itch for "Co-ordination", dangerous enough within a province, now has even more to answer for.

What are we to say, then, of so ill-judged a report ? Perhaps it is enough to say that the Council of Ministers should not be impressed by the expertise enlisted in its preparation, since there is no evidence that the expertise had much to do with the argument or the recommendations of the report.

C.B. Macpherson
Department of
Political Economy
University of Toronto

I Quantify, Therefore I am: The Peitchinis Report

Reading reports on education these days, especially those of certain economists, is a dispiriting business. How will this decade look to our descendants ? Will a future Miniver Cheevy miss the mass-produced grace of blue jeans ? Perhaps some plaintive laureate, dreaming of glories passed from the earth, will sing:

> Ere the final semester had added its load
> To the annual G. N. P.,
> I was a sessional post-doc.,
> And you were an F.S.E.

For the fact is that the metricians (econo-, bio-, psycho-, the lot) are now well ahead of the morticians, and we are measured for statistical embalmment and data-bank burial while still warm and in our own opinions alive. "I can measure anything", said a Professor of Psychiatry to me a few years ago. He was not quite with it, of course, or he would not have said "measure". He would have said "quantify".

> Quantify, quantify, my little man,
> Fake me a formula, fast as you can !
> Cook it, massage it — 'twill help guarantee
> The unalloyed grossness of our G.N.P.

We cannot even stand on our own feet any more. We stand — or sit if we have the presumption — on somebody's net assignable square feet. How beautiful are thy net assignable square feet with indoor/outdoor vinyl carpets, O Taxpayer's Representative's Third Deputy !

In short, the academics' disease, in our time, is the Quantification Itch. It is a morbid condition, characterized by severe vomiting of gobbets of undigested information and an attendant loss of vision that may be acute. Doubtless in the long run it's an unfortunate effect of our having taken a limited aspect of Newton too seriously. If we had only attended to what he had to say about the prophecies of Daniel, we might have been able to do some really useful things — such as talking back to a Jehovah's Witness. Even A. N.

Whitehead, who was not altogether opposed to Newton, recognized that what we have caught is an infection:

> Through and through the world is infected with quantity,

he noted in *The Aims of Education*.

Whitehead, however, did not let the thing get out of control. He might see history as a pattern of curves, but he was not so crass as to suppose that what is significant in human life can be caught in an arithmetic formula of some sort. He was as concerned as any practical tax-collector or tax-payer that education should be useful — but he was careful to say what he meant by "useful":

> . . . ideas that are not utilized are positively harmful. By utilizing an idea, I mean relating it to that stream, compounded of sense perceptions, feelings, hopes, desires, and of mental activities adjusting thought to thought, which forms our life.

He knew what he meant by "relevant", in short.

Unfortunately, one of the effects of the Quantification Itch (I shall hereafter refer to it as Q.I., warning any backward readers not to reverse the letters) is to pervert the sense of what is relevant. An advanced sufferer from Q.I. is subject to the fevered illusion that what is relevant is what is quantifiable, what is quantifiable is what is relevant. I quantify, therefore I am. In that future that I referred to, some imaginative theatrical producer will present Macbeth as the President of Glamis University, being visited by the Honourable Duncan King, Minister of Higher Education:

> Is this a formula I see before me ?
> . . . Come, let me clutch thee !
> I have thee not, and yet I see thee still !

Now, Professor Peitchinis has almost reached that advanced stage of Q.I. It is true that early in his report he indicates that he has not quite lost consciousness of the elements of utility to which Whitehead referred, and he argues that:

> . . . post-secondary institutions (must) assume the responsibility to design their programs in ways which will give the maximum benefit to those who participate in their processes. (Page 12).

We may suppose that "those who participate in their processes" are people: students and teachers, mostly. Within a page or two, however, the worse effects of Q.I. appear. "Those who participate in their processes" have become "products", "output", "resources". Products, output, and resources are quantifiable; people are not. Professor Peitchinis tosses and turns a little longer:

> . . . educational institutions can assist students to learn, they cannot produce a product,

he says (page 17). But he has already tipped his hand in a remarkable sentence in the same paragraph:

> Unlike processes of production using inanimate materials, . . . the output of educational institutions is merely deposited in human beings.

Having read that sentence and digested the words "merely deposited", you can either (a) close the volume, leaving more than 400 pages unread — unless you have foolishly agreed to write a review of it before having seen it; (b) turn to the recommendations; or (c) go back to Whitehead:

> When one considers in its length and in its breadth the importance of this question of the education of a nation's young, the broken lives, the defeated hopes, the national failures, which result from the frivolous inertia with which it is treated, it is difficult to restrain within oneself a savage rage.

If we choose to be more philosophical than Whitehead and take the middle course, we may turn to the recommendations and find Professor Peitchinis taking up a point that he has made on page 14:

> The choice of universities over other forms of post-secondary institutions on the part of those who are uncertain is not really a choice. Indeed, their drift into universities may be regarded as the consequence of a failure to choose. The fact is that the university provides the best climate for an aimless pursuit of "education".

Well, God save us from students who come to university in pursuit of an education, with or without quotation marks. We must not have young people in publicly subsidized institutions who are there as a result of an "aimless" — let me also play with punctuation — desire to know more, to understand themselves and the world better, to be more enlightened and more effective *people*. What a boob Ulysses was, to propose following knowledge like a sinking star — and at his age !

So to Recommendation 31:

> *The general subsidization of post-secondary education should be terminated forthwith. To the extent that it is socially desirable to subsidize certain programs of some students the subsidies should be made specific and should be related to the attainment of the social goals.*
> When pursued as a consumer good post-secondary education falls into the category of a luxury good. In this context, it is grossly inequitous *(sic)* to subsidize the consumption of luxuries when large segments of the population lack necessities. (Page 451.)

That final comment, which is the concluding sentence of the report, has a certain appeal. It is not difficult to see that if the principle that it states were generally applied, we should be completely reordering practically all our enterprises, public and private. If Professor Peitchinis is prepared to follow that route of argument, I am with him all the way to full socialism, which is where it leads. But he is not.

Of course there is a sense in which education is a luxury, as in an illiterate country reading and writing are luxuries, and in a starving country bread is a luxury. Even on the verge of madness, King Lear understood that point:

> . . . our basest beggars
> Are in the poorest thing superfluous :
> Allow not nature more than nature needs,
> Man's life's as cheap as beast's; . . .

Have we really reached a time in Canada when we must regard as a luxury public support of the notion that the

life is more than quantifiable meat, and the body more than quantifiable raiment ? I cannot believe it.

The merit of Professor Peitchinis's report, it seems to me, is that it forces that sort of question on us. It is not clear that this is what he intended, but he does so. He provides us, too, with some other reminders, almost equally salutary. He reminds us that we have a country — Is it the only one in the world ? What *is* the situation in Madagascar ? — that has not (and according to him cannot have) an educational policy or minister, so that it is easier for the Canadian government to influence schooling in Ceylon than in Saskatchewan. Even our great exemplar the United States has contrived to insert a little wedge of education between health and welfare at the federal level. He reminds us that we are explicitly concerned about manpower, but only tangentially and provincially concerned about education; so that the hand in one pocket does not know what the hand in the other pocket is doing, and — to catch the nearest example — the federal government finds it must recruit forty or so veterinarians from Europe because veterinarians are graduates of educational institutions, and education is a provincial concern. He reminds us — inadvertently — that the government of all Canadians may legislate about bilingualism until it is blue (or, rather, maple-leaf-coloured) in the face, but the provincial governments can subvert the whole intention by cancelling the requirements for language study in the schools — which is just what they have done. Above all, he reminds us that we are thinking crassly about our country and about education, so that institutions which ought to be a strengthening and invigorating force are in the gravest danger of being made a political football, divisive and debasing for us all. The unknown country of a few years ago becomes known and quantified — ten and divisible.

I have been re-reading some speeches that the Honourable John Robarts made, less than ten years ago, when he was thinking about education in Ontario:

> "We need an examination of the whole field of student aid, so that we may be assured that we have the most effective programmes and that no deserving student lacks the financial resources to continue in higher education if he is able."

So he spoke in the Legislature of Ontario in 1964. His intention was made even clearer by way of the Speech from the Throne in January 1965:

> "Education is the key to future progress. We must make every effort to provide the people of this province with an educational system that will allow each individual to develop his personality and abilities to the fullest, so that he can adjust to changes in his social environment and find rewarding employment."

He was not then talking about quantifying, nor about human "resources". He was talking about individuals and about personality, primarily — without at all forgetting the importance of work and of money. One would like to believe that when his successor, together with his fellow premiers and prime ministers, meet with the federal government, a few months from now, to consider the future of the Fiscal Arrangements Legislation, they too will have in mind that they are dealing with the future of individuals — not merely of human resources — and with the future of Canada — not merely of British Columbia or Quebec or Newfoundland.

As for the Quantification Itch, it has a strong hold on us. Unless one has a strong sense that — to use the language of Bergson — the current infatuation with the statistical is only a form of the encrustation of the mechanical, and that life is a good deal greater than either, the prospect must be depressing. The immediate treatment, of course, is a strengthening of the beneficent humours, coupled with purgatives and a notable accession of fresh air. I mean real fresh air, not the kind that is conditioned and quantified by a combination of net assignable square feet and a capital cost formula.

J. Percy Smith
Vice-President Academic
University of Guelph

Student Tenure

Academic Freedom and the Law. Report of the Commission appointed by the National Union of Students and by the National Council for Civil Liberties. London : NUS and NCCL, 1970. Pp. 58 - pp. 47 (appendices).

Since more elaborate grievance procedures are being drawn up in a number of Canadian universities, this report on the relation of students to their universities might be read with profit on many Canadian campuses. Among other useful sections, it includes a summary of some of the more recent British court cases concerning students, particularly those involving disruption and those actions brought by students claiming incorrect standing. It also suggests a detailed code of disciplinary procedure including a national review board — an adaptation of which might be of interest in those provinces with a number of universities.

However, the most interesting concept in this report is that of student tenure. The authors argue that British universities are already moving in that direction. British courts have held that there is a legally enforceable contract between the student and his college (Sammy v. Birkbeck College; Green v. Master and Fellows of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. This contract is between the university and the student — not his parents as would be the case, for instance, with a student at Eton or Harrow. This contract is for the duration of the degree or diploma course — not on a year by year basis. It is a licence to allow the student to use the facilities of the university provided he respects

its laws. But the Commission notes that such laws are not usually codified although the trend is in that direction. As a consequence it recommends what will surely occur, namely that the rules of the university be codified along with a system of formal hearing committees and that the university and the student sign this document as a contract. It further strongly recommends that codification and the creation of hearing committees be done in such a way that the students have a significant say in the formulation of these policies. Finally, the Commission holds that, although these procedures will allow the student redress in the courts, nevertheless it is preferable that academic disputes be settled within the university milieu, partly because the use of the courts has brought mixed results and partly because it is too time-consuming. It, therefore, suggests hearing committees within the university and a national appeal board called the "Higher Education Advisory Board". The result of all this is to create student tenure or a system whereby students have the right, once enrolled at the university, to pursue their course of study for the requisite number of years subject only to such laws as may be passed with student representatives present and voting and subject only to expulsion or dismissal with cause which must be proved, if the student so wishes, before a system of academic courts. This is a situation toward which a number of Canadian universities are moving. For instance, Queen's recently adopted a grievance procedure which attempts to codify offences and to create a formal system of hearing committees or tribunals.

It is curious that students, some of whom are now attacking the subject of faculty tenure with such vigour, have not noticed that some of the same objections that they have raised can also be levelled at student tenure. It can be argued, for instance, that the combination of rigid and formal structures (leading in the proposed code at Queen's to binding arbitration), particularly when combined with the trend toward the abolition of marking, will mean that no student will ever be removed from the university except for the most gross academic or disciplinary action partly because, as the students say, arbitration is so cumbersome that it will never be used, and partly because, with the downgrading of numerical marks, there will be no objective material to put before a hearing committee should the university wish to dismiss a student. It might be argued that under these circumstances the government and the taxpayer are being asked to subsidize students who have effectively built a system such that it is not necessary to work or to produce anything useful for the community. This is, of course, much the same argument as the students make against the tenured staff.

I would suggest that the argument in regard to both faculty and student tenure are false. In my view Canadian universities are more likely to move in the direction of pass-fail than the total abolition of marking, if only because both the universities and the society in which they exist are reasonably conservative. Thus students are likely to continue to be removed from the university for academic failure. Furthermore it seems to me that a system of hearing committees can be set up which are not unduly cumbersome. The model suggested in this report has merit. It recommends junior and senior tribunals, the difference being the penalty demanded by the prosecution. The Commission's deference to lawyers in these processes is unfortunate for I would have thought that the junior tribunal could be relatively informal. Presumably only cases involving suspension or expulsion of the student would warrant the use of the senior tribunal and very formal quasi-legal procedures.

One of the lessons for faculty in all this should be pretty clear. The result of the establishment of student tenure on the British pattern in Canadian universities would be to give students a more privileged position than junior faculty members. In many Canadian universities at the moment, a junior faculty member can be faced with the non-renewal of his contract prior to the decision to grant or to refuse tenure without recourse to a reasonable procedure of appeal and certainly without an arbitration. The junior faculty member is, of course, being excluded from the university. But any student who is to be expelled would likely have, if such new procedures were adopted, an absolute right to binding arbitration. Furthermore untenured faculty are frequently excluded as a class from promotion and tenure committees. At some universities the boards of governors are trying to impose such committees composed only of students and *seniors* faculty members. It is likely, however, that in the long run the only viable procedure will be for formal hearing committees to decide all cases of non-renewal, denial of tenure, and dismissal with cause as well as the expulsion of students with only one appeal, namely an arbitration.

Superficially this would not be as efficient as despotic rule — constitutionalism rarely seems to be. But it need not be particularly cumbersome. Contrary to popular opinion, every year there are tenured professors dismissed for cause. These rarely reach the ears of the academic public because the faculty member usually prefers to resign rather than face a hearing if he knows perfectly well that the charges are just. The same is likely to occur with students. Furthermore the experience of Victoria University might well suggest that it is inefficient to render arbitrary decisions without giving reasons or allowing the right to a proper hearing because the campus is certain to be thrown into turmoil by such patently unconstitutional acts. As Roderick Haig-Brown, the Chancellor of Victoria, noted to the C.A.U.T. *ad hoc* inquiry — it is difficult to understand on what principle of Canadian justice academics are tried without proof being offered or judicial proceedings being available.

Continued on p. 30

OMBUDSMEN

Response to Professors Karl A. Friedmann and B. A. Barker, "Ombudsmen in Universities", *C.A.U.T. Bulletin,* 23, 3 (1972).

Professors Friedmann and Barker in their article on ombudsmen suggest as a rationale that the individual professor or student finds himself powerless before the educational bureaucracy and that this justifies the creation of the post of university ombudsman. I would argue that it does nothing of the sort. Even accepting the premise (and supporting quotation) which I find a bit melodramatic, I would suggest that the most effective response is for faculty and student organizations to ensure the creation on every campus of proper and fair internal quasi-judicial procedures, in other words a form of administrative or public law. Specifically in the case of faculty contracts (i.e., renewal and the granting of tenure), I personally think that a system of primary hearings at the departmental or equivalent level followed by one appeal only in the form of an arbitration would provide infinitely more protection for the academic freedom of faculty than an army of ombudsmen. Such a system would still retain the distinction between an untenured professor who had to produce evidence to justify renewal or the granting of tenure and a tenured professor against whom the university would have to make a case for dismissal. But it would be much more just, expeditious and final than some of the incredibly cumbersome procedures now in vogue. I am also in favour of building in a brief conciliation procedure in grave cases to ensure that mediation as well as confrontation takes place. But I would want it specifically designated conciliation so that no one would be confused by the rather grander claims that have surrounded the use of ombudsmen. I fear that faculty associations, however, may be seduced by the glamour of the ombudsman idea and fail to push with adequate force for the much more important goal of securing such decent and fair quasi-judicial procedures on their campuses. Far too many Canadian universities still have minimal safeguards for the academic freedom of professors, particularly those who happen to be untenured.

Professors Friedmann and Barker rightly, in my view, point out that the advent of professors and students on the governing councils of universities does not guarantee freedom and justice for all. We have, alas, seen at least one notorious example in this country where the majority of the faculty and their representatives fully supported an ideological purge. However, I would suggest that the passions of democracy are best tempered not by an ombudsman but by a fair court system.

It is argued in the article that the ombudsman would become an agency of reform. Again I have my doubts. I am sure that in certain cases this will be true. But I think that in many others it will not. In one Canadian university the ombudsman already seems to interpret his role as explaining and expediting the use of existing university machinery. It so happens that in this particular university the procedures relating to contracts are antiquated and frequently unjust. If a professor is so foolish as to go to the ombudsman, not only will he likely be told that procedures have been followed (since these are minimal) and that nothing can be done, but furthermore the report will be forwarded to the president who will use it as ammunition in any further inquiries by the faculty association or by the C.A.U.T. In other words in this particular case the office of ombudsman seems merely to sanctify the *status quo* while at the same time giving a veneer of liberality to the whole enterprise. This is because the ombudsman has interpreted his role as one of explication of existing rules rather than one based on equity. But if he were to attempt to make his judgments, at least in part, on the basis of equity, what in fact would be equitable in regard to the faculty contracts? Would he consider the C.A.U.T. Policy Statement as the basis of equity? But if so, why not implement that statement with the proper administrative courts and forget about the ombudsman? If he should decide that equity means something less than the C.A.U.T. Policy Statement, could we accept that? I would hope not. But it would make defective procedures look a lot better and make it more difficult to secure change.

To be fair, Professors Friedmann and Barker suggest that each faculty association must assess its position concerning contracts vis-à-vis the ombudsman and issue appropriate suggestions to the faculty as to whether they should consult the ombudsman before or after the faculty association grievance committee. My feeling is that in most cases the faculty member would be ill-advised to take a case concerning contract to the ombudsman rather than to a proper appeal procedure and/or the local faculty association.

In fact, however, the office of ombudsman in the universities has traditionally been created to satisfy student demands. Even here I am not convinced that a proper system of appeals in which the judges and arbitrators are seen by all parties to be impartially and fairly chosen would not be better. But obviously many students do not think so, and Professors Friedmann and Barker are surely correct in urging professors and faculty associations to cooperate with university ombudsmen who are investigating student grievances.

However, in regard to faculty contracts I remain obdurately of the opinion that the proper hearings and arbitrations along the lines suggested above with the backing of a strong and independent faculty association remain more important safeguards for the academic freedom of professors.

Donald C. Savage.
C.A.U.T.

Ottawa, 14 August 1972

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FINANCING

Permit me to raise a matter of concern to the Canadian academic community, a concern which differs from others, such as suffocation in polluted air or in foreign embrace, in having a definite date attached to it.

Last March the federal-provincial agreements concerning the financing of tertiary education were extended for two years. This means that by March 1974 — in practice, quite a few months before — the parties concerned will have had to make up their minds about the suitability of the present arrangements (i.e., reimbursement of 50% of provincial expenditures to the provincial treasuries, more or less). The parties concerned will be the federal and provincial governments, unless the university community discovers its own concern and declares itself a party concerned. Ideally, such a discovery should yield it a chair at the negotiating table, but in practical terms it comes down to the urgent need to take a position and present it vigorously and in good time. Such a position will have to be based on a) a full understanding of the effects of the present arrangements on universities, on their proper functioning and on the measure of independence they require,* b) an understanding of the implications of an alternative most likely to be proposed by some of the governments involved, the surrender of federal tax points to the provinces in lieu of payments, and c) a search for arrangements conducive to qualitative enhancement of tertiary education in this country by a different utilization of its federal structure. Proposals about new definitions of the federal rôle have been made in the past. They should be re-examined and others could undoubtedly be added and weighed.

The acquisition of this understanding and the generation of proposals ought to be broadly based. No one institution, no one province is affected by such arrangements exactly as any other. The question is sufficiently important and urgent to warrant attention and action by every local chapter of C.A.U.T. The provincial organizations and the national office should not find it difficult to act as clearing houses. It is the attention of the undersigned to propose establishment of a study group to his own local association. If this were done during the current academic year some suggestions or schemes are sure to emerge by the spring of '73, in good time for discussion with other interested bodies, such as A.U.C.C. There is no guarantee that a splendid scheme will result from such efforts, or, even if it does, that it will be acceptable to the governments. It seems quite clear that the governments themselves are inhibited from searching for imaginative solutions by political considerations — which are not necessarily to be condemned. But it would be a sin of omission of historic proportions if university teachers failed to address themselves to this very fundamental matter with the vigour, imagination and industry that they regularly demand of their students in their assignments.

E.M. Oppenheimer,
Department of German,
31 July 1972. Carleton University.

* Some enlighted opinions on this subject were expressed during the Committee Hearings and House debate prior to extension of the agreements. (Finance, Trade and Commerce Committee, March 9, 14; House of Commons, March 16, 1972.)

(Editor's note : The C.A.U.T. has struck a committee composed of Professors C. B. Macpherson, J. Percy Smith, Jacques St. Pierre, Alwyn Berland and Gideon Rosenbluth to study the possibility of a C.A.U.T. position. The committee would welcome comments and suggestions.)

THE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Response to Eugene Benson, "Canadian Universities: Problems and Solutions", *C.A.U.T. Bulletin,* 20, 3 (1972).

Congratulations on your splendid and critical analysis of the factors which have led to our present crisis in higher education and for having formulated practical and imaginative solutions toward reformation of the system. I fully endorse your "élitist approach" to university enrolment on condition that centers for diversified vocational education be established in adequate numbers to compensate for the lower university enrolments. I am convinced that some of our academic colleagues would be prepared to be "absorbed" into an expanded vocational system, especially if they could be assured of a retraining period without serious loss in income.

Winnipeg, 29 June 1972

Alec Sehon, Ph.D., D.Sc.,
Professor and Head,
Department of Immunology,
Faculty of Medicine,
University of Manitoba.

C.A.U.T. Opting Out Survey

The following universities have adopted a policy whereby all faculty are considered to be members of the local association and of the C.A.U.T. unless they formally choose to opt out.

Alberta	Queen's
British Columbia	St. Thomas
Calgary	Saskatchewan (Saskatoon)
Guelph	Toronto
Lakehead	Trent
Laurentian	Waterloo
Loyola	Western
McMaster	Windsor
Mount St. Vincent	Winnipeg
Ottawa	York
Prince Edward Island	

Continued from p. 28

The university will probably never be a fully democratic institution, if only because the taxpayer as well as the students and faculty have a legitimate say in the way universities function. But it can be a constitutional university and by that I mean, to quote a cliché, an institution of laws rather than men. This report shows one method of ensuring that the students will live under the rule of law. Faculty associations should ensure that the same is true for all their members.

Donald C. Savage
C.A.U.T.

Written Reasons and the Risk of Libel Actions

The following report was commissioned by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee to provide guidance to those faculty associations faced with the argument that the offering of reasons will leave the university open to defamation suits. It was prepared by Professor Bruce Dunlop of the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto with the assistance of Professor J.-L. Baudoin of the Université de Montréal.

The Importance of Reasons

It is an important point of C.A.U.T. policy on academic appointments and tenure that the individual be entitled to know the reasons for an adverse decision. Thus the guideline on refusal of tenure provides that "If the committee proposes to recommend that tenure be denied it should, before making a formal recommendation, so notify the candidate in writing and give him a written statement of the reasons for the proposed recommendation".[1] And written reasons are justified as well in cases where promotion has been denied, a contract has been terminated or not renewed, perhaps even where a salary increase has been refused.

The point of putting reasons in writing is that it helps to ensure clear understanding and minimizes the possibility of subsequent dispute over what the reasons were. The point of giving reasons at all is partly covered by the guideline already quoted which goes on to say that "The candidate should have the right to meet with the committee and discuss the reasons, before a recommendation is arrived at".[2] He may have something to say that is both relevant and material to the issue and his contribution to the final decision can only adequately be ensured if he has a chance to address himself to the matters which appear to tell against him in the preliminary thinking of the committee. As to other decisions, too, the opportunity to attempt to influence the outcome should be available and, just as in the case of the tenure decision, to be fully effective it must involve the chance to meet unfavourable views put to or held by the decision maker as well as the chance to advance positive evidence and favourable arguments.

A second justification for the giving of reasons is to permit self-evaluation and self-improvement. Even where no opportunity or desire to appeal, either formally or informally, exists it is thus still in the best interest of the individual, and of those who wish him a better colleague or teacher, to tell him, at least when he wants to know, why an adverse decision has been made.

Finally, reasons for decisions sometimes have nothing to do with the qualities, or lack of them, in the individual about whom the decision is being made but, for example, may be dictated by budgetary considerations. Hence the conveying of reasons can help avoid misunderstanding and unnecessary ill-feeling.

Whether the reasons are related to the individual or not, however, there is something chilling in the notion of a system where fundamental interests can be affected without the individual necessarily knowing the explanation.

The Risk of Legal Action

In its efforts to have its views on the importance of giving written reasons widely adopted, the C.A.U.T. has met the argument, among others, that the process involves the risk of the person giving the reasons being subjected to a legal action for defamation. It would not, of course, be the conveying of the reasons to the individual about whom the decision has been made that would constitute the defamation, it would be the conveying of those reasons to others. However, giving them to the individual arms him with knowledge of what has been, or will be, said about him to others and hence increases the threat of a defamation action.

Because the C.A.U.T. believes that a lack of understanding of the law of defamation contributes to an undue fear of legal proceedings, it would seem in order to try to clarify the problem.

The law of defamation is quite complex and difficult. It should thus be said at once that an attempt to reduce it to a brief and manageable form will involve over-simplification. If that warning is borne in mind, the following exposition of the position in the common law provinces as well as under the Quebec Civil Code may nevertheless be of some use.

What Defamation Is

A communication is defamatory if it tends to affect adversely a person's reputation, to reduce the esteem, respect, goodwill or confidence he enjoys or arouse adverse, derogatory or unpleasant feelings or opinions against him. Defamation is most commonly, but not necessarily, verbal. Any method of communication can defame. Furthermore, a communication may be defamatory on its face, or it can be defamatory because of some knowledge possessed by the recipient which allows an inference to be drawn. For example, to say of a teacher that he taught nothing last term is not defamatory unless the audience happens to realize that he spent six hours a week in the class-room.

Publication : As the interest protected by a defamation action is the interest in reputation, the communication must be published, i.e., made to someone other than the person defamed. Everyone involved in the process is responsible for the result. Merely passing on what someone else has said constitutes publication and even to disclaim belief in what is being said does not affect this responsibility. It is not essential that one be believed in order to be guilty of defamation. Furthermore, if one publishes defamatory matter with reason to believe that it will be repeated, he is liable for the repetition.

Libel and slander : Defamation is either libel or slander. The distinction between the two is historical and anomalous. In the seventeenth century it was based on whether the communication was by written or spoken words. Libel subsequently came to embrace a number of other forms of communication that appealed to the sense of sight : drawings, statues, pictures, motion pictures, demonstrations and other forms of conduct carrying a defamatory implication. Slander tended to be confined to oral utterances. This distinction is not perfect, however. For example, reading a libel

[1] C.A.U.T. Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure, Section III, para. A8, published in the Bulletin winter number, 1970, pp. 12-31, at p. 24.
[2] *Ibid.*

aloud constitutes libel, perhaps because the defamatory matter is in durable form. The distinction has no significance in Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but in the other common law provinces all forms of libel are actionable without proof of actual damage whereas most forms of slander require such proof. The distinction may not be as important for our purposes as it would be in general, because one of the forms of slander actionable without proof of damage is that which might injure the person in his business, trade, profession or office. (The others are imputations of crime, venereal disease, or unchastity in a woman.) Nevertheless, the libel-slander distinction may be a reason why lawyers advise academic administrators not to give reasons in writing for decisions not to renew, promote or grant tenure.

Defences

The defences with which we would be particularly concerned would be :

1. Justification : If a defamatory statement is true this will always afford a defence to an action, but the burden of proof is on the defendant and if he fails to prove it he may be guilty of aggravating the damages, depending on whether the jury believes the defence an honest one.

2. Qualified privilege : To the good of society generally, the interest in one's reputation must sometimes take second place. The importance of freedom of communication may over-ride the importance of protecting the individual from defamation. When such a circumstance prevails, it is said that a privilege exists. There are absolute privileges — those attaching to utterances in Parliament or in judicial proceedings, and reports thereof — where the value attached to freedom of speech is held to be sufficient to render the motive, intent or purpose of the speaker irrelevant. But more commonly, privileges are qualified. Where there is a legal, social or moral duty or interest in making a communication and a corresponding interest or duty in receiving it the occasion will be considered one of qualified privilege. That is, immunity will be granted provided the communication does not go beyond what was reasonably necessary for the purpose and provided there was no "malice", meaning not only spite but ulterior motive or lack of belief in the statement.

Occasions of qualified privilege include :

(a) The performance of a public or private duty, such as assessing someone's qualifications for appointment, promotion or tenure as a member of a committee or holder of office charged with the task, or assessing a student's work and capability :

(b) the protection of an interest in a manner akin to self-defence, as where one who has been denied promotion or tenure seeks to vindicate himself ;

(c) responding to an invitation on the part of the person defamed, for example by giving an asked-for assessment of a teacher applying for a job or a student applying to graduate school ;

(d) responding to a request from a potential employer for an opinion of a prospective employee ;

(e) communicating on a matter of common interest, as where a case of suspected cheating on an examination, plagiarism in a learned paper or theft of a book from the library is reported to the appropriate official or body ;

3. *Fair comment :* Society, or segments of it, may have an interest in receiving fair comment on some matters that over-rides the individual interest in reputation. It must be clear that the publication is comment rather than fact, and as comment it must be based upon true facts. It is this particular defence which is the foundation of artistic and literary criticism and the support for discussion of public affairs and those who engage in them. Comment is fair provided that a fair-minded man could have formed or expressed the view or opinion. It need not necessarily evoke widespread agreement, nor be in moderate terms. The comment must not be motivated by malice.

Situation Under the Quebec Civil Code

Responsibility for oral or written defamation is based under civil law on Section 1053 C.c., which establishes the general principle of responsibility based on fault. *In substance,* the solutions given to the problem under the Civil Code are practically identical to those offered under common law, even if there are substantial differences in procedures and methods.

Defamation arises under the Civil Code where a communication in any form (written, spoken, etc.) wrongly causes damage to the reputation or honour of a person. In such a case, responsibility is shared, in principle, by the author of the defamatory statement and the publisher.

Under Quebec jurisprudence, the mere fact of having acted in good faith is not an excuse or a defence, but may at most mitigate the damage. However, the defender in a defamation case may validly plead the truth of the spoken or written statements alleged to be defamatory. There is a defence based on privilege and a doctrine similar to the common law's fair comment.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the courts do not hesitate to grant moral damages to the victim, even where the defamatory statements have not been publicized.

Conclusions

It would appear that the qualified privilege which protects a university officeholder, committee member or teacher when he must, as part of his job, form and convey opinions about colleagues or students is ample protection. There are limits to be observed, but apart from the law of defamation one would assume the requirements that opinions be honestly held and discreetly disseminated would be considered the norm within the university community when the question of tenure, promotion, contract renewal, professional qualification or personal conduct are being considered.

There can be no guarantee against the commencement of a defamation action. It is thus conceivable that even one who has observed the niceties of the law may be put to substantial inconvenience in order successfully to defend himself. If the alleged defamation occurred in the course of performing his duty to the university, the expense should be borne by the university.

It is also conceivable that individuals will exceed the limits of the privilege and will be successfully sued. Again, if the defamation occurred in the course of performance of a duty to the university, the damage award as well as the cost of litigation should be borne by the university.

The possibility of legal action must simply be part of the price to be paid for fair procedures within the university.

canadian association of university teachers

Association	President	Secretary	Treasurer
Acadia	K. D. C. Haley	Ray Thompson	Doewe Van der Baaren
Alberta	L. G. S. Newsham	J. Funke	H. I. Freedman
Bishop's	R. Barnett	D. Seale	W. Taylor
Brandon	R. E. Florida	T. A. Mitchell	D. Spencer
U.B.C.	R. A. Spencer	A. Turner	R. S. Rosenberg
Brock	J. Kushner	J. Michielson	J. Auer
Calgary	Hisao P. Arai	D. Bercuson	C. Ozol
C.M.C. — RMC	C. D. McKay	S. Henchisi	D. W. Newcombe
RR	H. J. Duffus	G. M. Lancaster	H. E. Rankin
CMR	W. J. Bissonnette	A. S. Biffi	A. S. Biffi
Carleton	J. Brown	T. Middlebro	C. Farmer
Dalhousie	P. B. Huber	W. G. Young	R. F. Chandler
Guelph	N. V. Bowen	P. Hull	M. Savan
Lakehead	H. N. McLeod	J. F. Hilliker	I. M. Hoodless
Laurentian-Laurentienne	J. D. Dewar	M. Paterson	B. C. Cameron
Laval	M. Baril	G. Parent	J. de la Noüe
Lethbridge	F. J. Papp	R. J. Fletcher	E. G. Mardon
Loyola	G. Adams	L. McI[illegible]	C. Kalman
Manitoba	J. Lehrman	D. Bele[illegible]	K. J. Hughes
McGill	S. Shapiro	L. Butler	P. J. Harris
McMaster	W. Hunter	G. E. Purnell	D. E. N. Jensen
Memorial	G. P. Jones	B. Hann	P. Fisher
Moncton	J. Cadieux	G. Clermont	E. Léger
Montréal	Robert Brunet	H. F. Gautrin	Roger Morazain
Mount Allison	K. A. H. Adams	P. Bogaard	P. Bogaard
Mount St. Vincent	Sister Brenda Halton	P. Wrenn	D. Lyons
U. New Brunswick	H. Sharp	R. M. Lees	M. Chapmon
Notre Dame of Nelson	A. Child	P. Micallef	N. Thyer
Nova Scotia Tech. Col.	J. D. Brown	V. K. Aatre	V. K. Aatre
Ottawa	M. Leblanc	K. Szalay	P. Trudel
O.I.S.E.	J. H. House	E. Ragen	D. H. Brundage
U.P.E.I.	W. Pineau	W. MacIntyre	L. Parker
Queen's	R. W. Mackenzie	R. W. Malcolmson	B. Batchelor
St. Francis Xavier	S. Currie	D. Wood	D. Wood
St. John's	G. Rothney	M. Allen	C. Wood
St. Mory's	R. Crowther	K. Tudor	V. Tobin
St. Thomas	J. W. Poole	A. Brennan	A. Brennan
Sask. Regina	P. Hemingway	W. D. Larson	W. D. Larson
Sask. Sask.	G. H. M. Thomas	R. L. Eager	J. F. Morgan
Simon Fraser	M. L. Benston	J. d'Auria	D. Dunn
Sir George Williams	J. Mouledoux	G. Cadenhead	B. Markland
Toronto	M. S. Uzumeri	P. Corey	M. E. Berridge
Trent	R. D. Chambers	W. A. McMullen	J. A. Wiseman
Victoria	J. C. E. Greene	J. C. E. Greene	D. W. Knowles
Waterloo	H. K. Ellenton	J. Whiton	G. S. Mueller
Waterloo Lutheran	G. Noonan	J. Hall	E. Symes
Western Ontario	D. S. Hair	M. A. Nerenberg	P. M. Chefurka
Windsor	J. Rezek	C. A. Querbach	R. F. Jacobs
Winnipeg	R. A. Khan	M. K. Kerr	M. K. Kerr
York	M. Horn	Sandra Pyke	A. W. Turner

association	président	secrétaire	trésorier

association canadienne des professeurs d'université

Printed by :
Imprimé par : LE DROIT, Ottawa, Ont.

C.A.U.T. CHRISTMAS SPECIAL

CHRISTMAS IN TUNISIA FOR $305.00

Round trip to London by BOAC Boeing 707 C.A.U.T. Charter
Leave Toronto DECEMBER 19th, 1972
Return JANUARY 2nd, 1973
London/Tunis DECEMBER 22nd BAC-111 Jet
Return January 1st

Rate Includes : — Transatlantic Charter
Lord Brothers Tunisia Package Holiday —
★ Flight London/Tunis/London
★ Transfers Airport/Hotel/Airport
★ Accommodation at the beautiful Les Orangers and the brand new Bel Azur Hotel, basis of sharing twin-bedded room with private bath
★ 3 meals daily

(Children under 12 yrs. sharing parents' room — $255.00)

ALSO AVAILABLE

Toronto/London round trip charter only — $175.00 Adult
$155.00 Child
For further information and reservations contact —

FINLAY TRAVEL LIMITED
P.O. Box 83, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto 111
Tel. : (416) 366-4936

OFFRE SPÉCIALE DE L'A.C.P.U. POUR NOËL

PASSEZ LA NOËL EN TUNISIE POUR $305

Voyage aller-retour en Boeing 707 de BOAC nolisé par l'A.C.P.U.
Départ de Toronto le 19 DÉCEMBRE 1972
Retour le 2 JANVIER 1973
Londres/Tunis : le 22 DÉCEMBRE — Jet BAC-111
Retour le 1er JANVIER

Le tarif comprend : — vol transatlantique par avion nolisé
— vacances en Tunisie organisées par Lord Brothers :
★ vol Londres/Tunis/Londres
★ transport aéroport/hôtel/aéroport
★ séjour au bel hôtel Les Orangers et au nouvel hôtel Bel Azur, à raison de deux personnes dans une chambre avec lits jumeaux et salle de bain privée.
★ 3 repas par jour

(Les enfants de moins de 12 ans qui partagent la chambre de leurs parents paient $255.00)

AUSSI

Toronto/Londres : aller-retour par vol nolisé — $175 — adultes
$155 — enfants
Pour de plus amples détails et pour les réservations, adressez-vous à :

FINLAY TRAVEL LIMITED
B.P. 83, Centre Toronto-Dominion
Toronto 111
tél. : (416) 366-4936